DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 437 712 EA 029 989

AUTHOR	Green, Harry A.; Norman, John F, .; McClure, C. Bennett, II
TITLE	Tennessee Public Infrastructure Needs Inventory Assessment for FY 1998. A Commission Report to the 101st General Assembly.
SPONS AGENCY	Tennessee General Assembly, Nashville.
PUB DATE	1999-01-00
NOTE	83p.; Prepared by the Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Construction Costs; Construction Needs; *Educational Facilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Facility Improvement; *Needs Assessment; School Buildings; *State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Tennessee

ABSTRACT

This report represents the first effort by any public or private agency or organization to provide a comprehensive assessment of Tennessee's public infrastructure needs. Hundreds of local government officials and private citizens contributed information to this research. The main participants in the infrastructure inventory were the local governments being surveyed by the Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the nine development districts that are contracted to conduct inventory surveys. The key participants were the various local governments and officials who determine infrastructure needs in each community across the state. The report is divided into two sections. The first part contains survey information on general infrastructure needs that was collected from local governments and other entities. The second part examines K-12 education infrastructure needs. All of the states 138 K-12 public school systems were surveyed. Results from the local-government surveys indicate that $13.7 billion is needed for infrastructure projects and improvements. These improvements included transportation projects, capital-improvement plans, mandated requirements, and water and waste-water accounts. The K-12 public education survey uncovered infrastructure needs totaling $2.5 billion. Needed improvements include basic repairs to bring all schools up to at least a "good" condition. Thirty-five appendices provide further information. (RJM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 437 712

Education

Transportation

Water and Wastewater

Industrial Sites

Solid Waste

Recreation

Low & Moderate Income Housing

Tele-communications

Public Health Buildings

Other Public Facilities

EA 029 989

A Commission Report to the 101st General Assembly

Tennessee

Public Infrastructure Needs Inventory Assessment

for

FY 1998

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Green

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

January 1999

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State of Tennessee

Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

Legislative Members

Sen. Robert Rochelle, *CHAIR*
Lebanon

Senator Ward Crutchfield
Chattanooga

Senator Tommy Haun
Greeneville

Senator Douglas Henry
Nashville

Senator Jeff Miller
Cleveland

Representative Jere Hargrove
Cookeville

Representative Matthew Kisber
Jackson

Representative Steve McDaniel
Lexington

Representative Randy Rinks
Savannah

Representative Larry Turner
Memphis

Other Members

Truman Clark, *VICE CHAIR*
Carter County Executive

Nancy Allen
Rutherford County Executive

Mayor Victor Ashe
Knoxville

Chaddy Baker
Nashville

Lana Bowman Ball
Jonesborough

David Coffey
Oak Ridge

Mary Jo Dozier
Councilwoman of Clarksville

Mayor Sharon Goldsworthy
Germantown

Jeff Huffman
Tipton County Executive

Commissioner Ruth Johnson
Department of Revenue

Judy Medearis
County Officials Assn. of TN

Maynard Pate
TN Development Distrct Assn

Mayor Jim Rout
Shelby County

Mayor Tom Rowland
Cleveland

Comptroller William Snodgrass
Comptroller of Treasury

Thomas Varlan
Knoxville

TACIR:

Harry A. Green
Executive Director

Address:

226 Capitol Blvd., Suite 508
Nashville, TN 37243
615-532-2443 (FAX)
615-741-3012

January 1999

The Honorable John S. Wilder
Speaker of the Senate

The Honorable Jimmy Naifeh
Speaker, House of Representatives

Members of the General Assembly

State Capitol
Nashville, TN 37243

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We are transmitting herewith an assessment of public infrastructure needs identified by local governments and other entities in Tennessee. The Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (TACIR) was directed by Public Chapter No. 817, Acts of 1996, to annually compile and maintain an inventory of needed public infrastructure within the state. That Act also directs the TACIR to present these infrastructure needs and related costs to the General Assembly.

From the beginning of this monumental process, the TACIR adopted a goal to make the infrastructure inventory relative to other local, regional, and statewide economic development goals and plans. This report is viewed as a tool that can assist Tennessee in managing such initiatives as Tennessee's new and comprehensive growth policy legislation: Public Chapter 1101, Acts of 1998.

This report represents the first effort by any public or private agency or organization to provide such a comprehensive infrastructure needs assessment.

Sincerely,

Senator Robert Rochelle
Chairman

Harry A. Green, Ph.D.
Executive Director and
Research Director

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Tennessee
Public Infrastructure Needs Inventory Assessment for FY 1998

Prepared by:

Harry A. Green
Executive Director and
Project Director

John F. Norman
Associate Executive Director
and Project Manager

C. Bennett McClure, II
Research Associate
and Project Coordinator

Technical Support:

Cherri Brady
Publications Assistant

The Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

January 1999

Acknowledgements

Many people representing a varied assortment of organizations and agencies contributed to the content of this report. It must be noted that this report could not have been completed without the cooperation of the many county and municipal officials responding to the survey questions of the Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (TACIR). We also thank officials representing special districts, chambers of commerce, economic development agencies, and other private citizens for identifying infrastructure needs from the perspectives of their organizations.

The arduous task of collecting infrastructure needs data from local governments and other entities was accomplished by the staff of Tennessee's nine development districts. The development district directors are:

Susan Roberts-Reid
Executive Director
First Tennessee Development District

Robert Freeman
Executive Director
East Tennessee Development District

Joe Guthrie
Executive Director
Southeast Tennessee Development District

Wendy Askins
Executive Director
Upper Cumberland Development District

Maynard Pate
Executive Director
Greater Nashville Development District

Joe Max Williams
Executive Director
South Central Tennessee Development Dist.

Robert W. Brandon
Executive Director
Northwest Tennessee Development District

Evelyn C. Robertson, Jr.
Executive Director
Southwest Tennessee Development District

John Sicola
Executive Director
Memphis Area Association of Governments

Special thanks also goes to Dr. Ernestine McWherter, Executive Director of the Tennessee Organization of School Superintendents and members of the Superintendents' Study Council for their help in designing the K-12 public education infrastructure needs survey instrument. Jim Stephens and Jim Jones from the Tennessee Department of Education also provided input into the development of that survey instrument.

Technical assistance in the development of the eighteen regional databases (a "general infrastructure" database and "K-12 education" facilities database for each development district) and in a similar format, two state-wide databases used in creating this report was developed with the assistance of Mr. Griff Akins and Ms. Donporn Wangsawiboon. The services of Mr. Akins and Ms. Wangsawiboon were provided through a contract with the Business and Economic Research Center at Middle Tennessee State University. Dr. Reuben Kyle, Director of the Business and Economic Research Center, was instrumental in expediting the contract and for arranging the services of these MTSU Computer Information Systems interns.

Table of Contents

Page

Acknowledgements i

Table of Contents iii

Introduction 1

Background 3

FY 1998 Public Infrastructure Executive Summary 5

Total of All Infrastructure Needs 5
Total General Infrastructure Needs 5
General Infrastructure Needs Quick Facts 5
Total K-12 Public Education Infrastructure Needs 5
K-12 Public Education Infrastructure Quick Facts 6

Part 1: General Infrastructure Needs Inventory 7

Survey Results 7
Ownership 9
Capital Improvement Plans 9
Stage of Development 11
Mandates 13

Part 2: K-12 Education Infrastructure Needs 15

Prior Estimates of Education Infrastructure Needs 16
The FY 1998 Education Survey Form 16
Current Campus Conditions 16
Mandates 17
Technology 17
Future Campus Needs and the Education Improvement Act of 1992 17
The FY 1998 General Survey Form 18
Survey Results 18
Conclusion 23

Appendix 25

INTRODUCTION

The Public Infrastructure Needs Inventory Act (P.C. No. 817 of 1996) requires the Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (TACIR) to annually compile and maintain an inventory of needed public infrastructure within the state. The General Assembly determined that an inventory of infrastructure needs is necessary in order for the state and local governments to develop goals, strategies and programs to:[1]

- improve the quality of life of its citizens;
- support livable communities; and
- enhance and encourage the overall economic development of the state.

From the beginning of the data collection and analysis process, the Commission had one primary goal for the inventory:[2]

> *"Make the public infrastructure needs inventory relative to overall local, regional and statewide economic development goals and plans initiated in Tennessee."*

In 1998, the Tennessee General Assembly passed a law that has become the most comprehensive growth policy legislation ever enacted in this state. This legislation, Public Chapter 1101, represents a new vision for growth policy in Tennessee. Public infrastructure plays an important part in the growth policy aspect of P.C. 1101. Section 7 of that Act pertains to factors local governments must consider when identifying specific growth areas. Public infrastructure is one of the most critical issues local governments must address to comply with Section 7 of the new act.

Specifically, that section states that each city and county must determine and report the projected costs of providing infrastructure, urban services and public facilities – in their respective areas of responsibility – and determine the feasibility of recouping such costs by the imposition of taxes. Local governments must conduct an inventory and analysis of services for the urban growth boundaries, the planned growth areas, and the rural areas.

For those local governments that annually construct a capital improvement plan (CIP), the analysis of service needs will be somewhat easier. However for local governments, who do not construct a CIP, the infrastructure data collected by TACIR is the only information available for analysis from these communities. In the future, the TACIR and the development districts of Tennessee will focus on adapting our infrastructure survey to meet the critical needs of local governments in their efforts to comply with P.C. 1101.

This report represents the first effort by any public or private agency or organization to provide a comprehensive assessment of all public infrastructure needs in Tennessee. Hundreds of local government officials and private citizens have contributed information to TACIR's voluminous infrastructure database. Much of this data can be used, with the infrastructure reporting requirements of P.C. 1101 specifically in mind, for other purposes. The data for specific categories of infrastructure will be shared with those agencies of Tennessee's state government responsible for their planning and implementation.

BACKGROUND

On April 11, 1996, the General Assembly passed the Public Infrastructure Needs Inventory Act, sponsored by Senator Robert Rochelle (Senate District 17) and Representative Shelby Rhinehart (House District 37). This Act was signed into law by Governor Sundquist as Public Chapter No. 817 on April 25, 1996. The Act, which became effective July 1, 1996, requires the Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (TACIR) to be the lead agency for compiling and maintaining an annual inventory of needed public infrastructure within the state. See Appendix 3 for a copy of this act.

Early support for an infrastructure needs inventory came from the Rebuild Tennessee Coalition (RTC) and the Tennessee Development District Association (TDDA). The RTC is a coalition of public and private organizations committed to reversing the decline in Tennessee's investment in infrastructure. The TDDA is comprised of the nine development districts that provide planning and development assistance to the local governments in their respective regions. See Appendix 1-B for a list of development districts and the counties each district serves.

The main participants in the infrastructure inventory are the local governments being surveyed, the TACIR, and the nine development districts that are contracted to conduct inventory surveys. The key participants in the inventory are the various local governments and officials, who determine infrastructure needs in each community across the state.

Public Chapter 817 requires that, as a minimum, the following entities be surveyed to determine their infrastructure needs:[3]

- county executives;
- mayors;
- local planning commissions;
- local education agencies;
- utility districts;
- county road superintendents; and
- other appropriate local and state officials as deemed necessary.

The TACIR has contracted with the state's nine development districts to administer infrastructure inventory surveys to these officials and agencies within the counties located within their district boundaries. These surveys are being used to ascertain planned and anticipated infrastructure needs over the next five-year period, together with estimated costs and time of need, within the five-year time frame.

On a county-by-county basis, each development district has inventoried the needs within each of the following broad categories of infrastructure:[4]

- Education (K-12 and other facilities);
- transportation (i.e., roads, bridges, airports, etc.);
- water and wastewater;
- industrial sites;
- solid waste;
- recreation;
- low and moderate income housing;
- telecommunications;
- public health buildings;
- public buildings; and
- other public facilities as deemed necessary by the TACIR.

The development districts have contacted local government officials in order to facilitate the administration of surveys. Whenever possible, surveys are administered during face to face meetings with the representatives from the local government or agency being surveyed.

The development district staffs have compiled the results of their surveys and submitted them to the TACIR. The TACIR compiles the results from each development district into a master inventory, that is the base document for the annual report to the General Assembly.

The contents of this report are divided into two distinct areas. The first part contains information collected from our survey of local governments and other entities on general infrastructure needs, which includes all categories of need in the legislation except K-12 public education facilities. The second part of this document is dedicated totally to the K-12 education infrastructure needs.

FY 1998 PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Total of All Infrastructure Needs

The FY 1998 public infrastructure survey identified $13.7 billion in needed infrastructure projects and improvements as identified by local officials and other relevant individuals across the state. These $13.7 billion in identified needs represent approximately $11.2 billion in the category of "general" infrastructure needs and another $2.5 billion in public K-12 education infrastructure needs. All in all, respondents to our survey included 603 municipal officials, 182 county officials, and 191 individuals from other entities such as utility districts, chambers of commerce, and other special districts. In addition, officials at all of Tennessee's 138 K-12 public education school systems provided information reported in this document.

Total General Infrastructure Needs

General infrastructure needs include all categories of needs ***except*** those associated with K-12 public education. The total of all general infrastructure needs, by specific category, is shown in Table 1 of this report. There were 4,947 general infrastructure projects reported with a cost of $11.2 billion.

General Infrastructure Needs Quick Facts

- Transportation projects account for 1,092 (one fifth) of the total 4,947 general projects and $4.5 billion (40 percent) of all general project costs;
- 1,884 (38.1 percent) of the general infrastructure projects were identified from local government Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs);
- Projects identified in CIP's account for 50.8 percent of total general infrastructure needs costs—$5.7 billion of $11.2 billion in general costs.
- Of the 4,947 total general infrastructure projects, 3,120 (63 percent) are reported by municipalities while 807 (16 percent) are reported by counties.

Mandate-Related Needs

- 262 projects (about 5 percent of all reported projects) were identified as being needed because of a mandate requirement.
- These mandate required projects have a cost totaling over $402 million (3.6 percent of the total cost of all general project costs).
- Water and wastewater accounts for 143 (almost 55 percent) of the mandate related projects at a cost of $253 million (over 58 percent) of all mandated projects.

Total K-12 Public Education Infrastructure Needs

All of Tennessee's 138 K-12 public school systems were surveyed to ascertain K-12 public education infrastructure needs. Two survey instruments were used to determine K-12 education infrastructure needs. The first instrument consisted of a special form designed in conjunction with the Tennessee Organization of School Superintendents (TOSS) and the Superintendents Study

Council. This form was designed to collect information on the infrastructure needs of existing school facilities. The second form was the General Infrastructure Survey Form. This form was sent to all school superintendents specifically to determine the needs for new school construction. Every public K-12 school system in the state responded with at least some information requested from our survey. Table 7 in this report shows the total K-12 public education infrastructure needs and breaks out the cost by category.

K-12 Public Education Infrastructure Quick Facts

- K-12 public education infrastructure needs totaled $2.5 billion;
- Over 60 percent of Tennessee's 1580 K-12 public schools report an overall facility rating of either "good" or "excellent" condition;
- It will cost a reported $1 billion over the next five years to bring all other schools in the state up to at least a "good" condition;
- School officials report that 78.2 percent of Tennessee's 41,265 classrooms are rated in either a "good" or "excellent" condition;
- Barely half of Tennessee's 2,198 portable classrooms can be rated as being in either a "good" or "excellent" condition;
- School officials responding to the survey indicated a need for $246 million for computer-related technology;

Mandate Related Needs

- Local education agencies report that they will have to expend $91 million over the next five years to comply with federal and state mandates (this does not include any cost related to complying with the Education Improvement Act),
- 585 schools (37 percent) statewide report a facility need that is mandate related;
- By far, the most expensive mandate for the state's K- 12 public schools relates to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act – $55 million or 58 percent of all reported school facility mandate costs;

EIA Compliance

- Of the 1580 K-12 public schools in Tennessee;
  - 1,057 report EIA compliance
  - 504 do not comply
  - 19 did not respond
- Compliance with the EIA will require at least $910 million in additional school facilities through the 2002-03 school year.

Part I

General Infrastructure Needs Inventory

Public Chapter 817 lists eleven broad categories of what has come to be called in the TACIR surveys "general infrastructure" elements:[5]

- Education (K-12 and other facilities);
- transportation (i.e., roads, bridges, airports, etc.);
- water and wastewater;
- industrial sites;
- solid waste;
- recreation;
- low and moderate income housing;
- telecommunications;
- public health buildings;
- public buildings; and
- other public facilities as deemed necessary by the TACIR.

General infrastructure contains all those services and facilities except those involving public K-12 education facilities. K-12 education facilities are addressed in Part 2 of this report. To acertain the general infrastructure needs of the state, local officials and other entities such as chambers of commerce and utility districts were asked to complete the FY1998 General Survey Form. This form is included in this report as Appendix 1-A. The form was developed by the staff of the TACIR in consultation with the staffs of Tennessee's nine development districts to collect the following information:

- the county in which the project is located;
- the municipality in which the project is located;
- the type or category of the project;
- the ownership or controlling entity of the project;
- the geographic location of the project such as street address or best available landmark;
- the status/stage of project in the following terms:
  - Conceptual (project is an idea or concept)
  - Planning & Design (project is on paper and has received significant analysis)
  - Construction (project has moved earth, poured concrete, etc.)
- the projected start and finish dates for the project;
- whether the project is listed in the reporting entity's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP);
- the estimated cost of the project;
- a list of all possible funding sources;
- whether the project is the result of a mandate; and
- how this project is linked or related to other reported infrastructure projects.

Survey Results

Analysis of the FY1998 General Infrastructure Survey Forms indicates 4,947 projects identified by local governments as being needed across the state. The total reported cost of these projects is $11,154,772,676.

Table 1 shows the General Infrastructure Needs Reported by Type. The infrastructure types in the table are ranked by cost in descending order. The table contains 20 categories of infrastructure instead of the nine broad categories contained in the

Table 1
General Infrastructure Needs Reported by Type
(excludes K-12 Education)

Type of Infrastructure	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects	Percentage of Total
Transportation	1,092	$4,491,517,923	40.3%
Water and Wastewater	1,538	$2,633,706,661	23.6%
Public Buildings	339	$458,078,160	4.1%
Recreation	530	$456,447,821	4.1%
Other Utilities (gas, electric and multiple services)	85	$420,727,401	3.8%
Law Enforcement	131	$393,600,752	3.5%
Industrial Sites and Parks	218	$362,321,395	3.2%
Libraries and Museums	86	$310,790,593	2.8%
Stormwater	123	$288,971,368	2.6%
Business District Development	44	$258,140,869	2.3%
Navigation	1	$250,000,000	2.2%
Non K-12 Education	13	$131,758,543	1.2%
Community Development	21	$118,727,327	1.1%
Housing	135	$115,651,900	1.0%
Telecommunications	101	$104,172,930	0.9%
Fire Protection	201	$98,430,121	0.9%
Solid Waste	135	$86,125,766	0.8%
Other Facilities	61	$61,748,396	0.6%
Property Acquisition	8	$61,025,000	0.5%
Public Health	85	$52,829,750	0.5%
Statewide Totals	**4,947**	**$11,154,772,676**	**100.0%**

Public Infrastructure Needs Inventory Act. This increase in the number of categories is necessary because the extremely high number of projects originally categorized as "public buildings" and "other." For the purposes of this report, the public buildings category is broken down into the following categories:

- libraries and museums;
- public health; and
- other public facilities.

The "other" category has been broken down to include the following new project categories:

- law enforcement;
- stormwater;
- business district development;
- navigation;
- community development;
- fire protection; and
- property acquisition.

Not surprisingly, transportation related infrastructure needs are the most costly items in the survey outdistancing water and wastewater infrastructure needs by an almost two to one margin. Approximately 64 percent of all costs reported in the survey relate to these two categories of public infrastructure, with transportation at 40.3 percent and water – wastewater at 23.6 percent.

Appendix 1 provides a count of projects and the related cost for each type of general infrastructure as reported by county. If a county is not listed in an appendix, no projects were reported (Appendices 1-C through 1-W).

As required by the infrastructure legislation, TACIR contacts other state agencies to determine any overlap of the needs reported by local governments in our survey and the State of Tennessee. TACIR staff verified that only 89 of the 1,068 total transportation projects are included in an inventory of the State Department of Transportation. Based on our survey findings, these overlapping projects have a total reported cost of $1,334,595,000. This accounts for 29.7 percent of the reported cost of all transportation projects. However, of these 89 projects in our survey, 11 do not

provide a cost estimate. Similarly, TACIR staff has verified that only 8 of the 510 recreation projects are identified in an inventory by the Department of Environment and Conservation. Our survey reports that these projects have a total reported cost of $2,150,000. This accounts for only 0.5 percent of the cost of all recreation projects in our survey. The low number of projects identified by this survey that are included in an inventory by other state agencies, demonstrates that our survey is meeting the goal of identifying new infrastructure projects that are needed by communities across the state.

The General Survey Form also collects data on non K-12 education facilities, such as technology centers and community learning facilities. Additionally, the information collected on the General Infrastructure Form addresses needed infrastructure while the Education Survey From requests information and needs on existing K-12 facilities. Thus, there is more data available for K-12 facilities than for those projects addressed in the General Infrastructure Survey.

Ownership

For each project, the General Survey Form asks for the ownership or controlling entity for each of the reported projects. While projects in the vast majority of cases are reported as needs by city and county government officials, the ultimate responsibility for operation and ownership is sometimes indicated as either state, federal, joint, or other.

Table 2 shows the reported general infrastructure needs by ownership and the number and cost of projects by type of infrastructure.

Overall, ownership of projects could be ascribed to one of the six following categories:

- City;
- County;
- State;
- Federal
- Joint; and
- Other.

Joint ownership represents those projects where the official being surveyed reported a need whose implementation responsibility would rest with a combination of public agencies at multiple levels of government and/or in partnership with the private sector. The "other" category represents ownership by an independent public entity such as a utility and/or other special districts and authorities.

Projects that would be the responsibility of municipal governments to implement accounted for 63.1 percent (3,120 of 4,947) of all projects reported in the general survey. The 3,120 projects account for about $5.1 billion of the $11 billion in reported costs. Table 2 also shows that 807 projects identified in the survey would be "owned" or have ultimate responsibility for implementation in the hands of county government. These projects account for about $1.5 billion of the $11 billion in reported costs for all projects. The $1.5 billion represents almost 14 percent of the costs for projects statewide.

Capital Improvement Plans

Table 3 shows the infrastructure projects identified by local governments as being in their Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). From the beginning of TACIR's involvement in the Public Infrastructure Needs Inventory Act of 1996, staff has stressed the importance of CIPs to local governments for two reasons. First, communities using a CIP as a planning tool, increase the possibility for capital savings for that community and the state. Second, projects listed in CIPs are less likely to be "wish list" projects, and are usually taken seriously by those entities having a role in the planning and funding of capital infrastructure. Certain categories of infrastructure reflect a large percentage of

Table 2
General Infrastructure Needs Project Ownership
(by Type of Project)

	CITY		COUNTY		STATE		FEDERAL		JOINT*		OTHER**		TOTAL	
Type of Project	No. of Projects	Cost of Projects	No. of Projects	Cost of Projects	No. of Projects	Cost of Projects	No. of Projects	Cost of Projects	No. of Projects	Cost of Projects	No. of Projects	Cost of Projects	No. of Projects	Cost of Projects
Transportation	524	$941,511,772	236	$638,210,151	264	$2,767,554,000	1	$0	58	$102,736,000	9	$41,506,000	1,092	$4,491,517,923
Water/Wastewater	1,041	$2,038,926,258	73	$137,541,118	1	$123,000	0	$0	29	$107,716,152	394	$349,400,133	1,538	$2,633,706,661
Public Buildings	229	$292,846,136	84	$117,659,024	1	$200,000	1	$300,000	18	$41,913,000	6	$5,160,000	339	$458,078,160
Recreation	418	$320,522,357	80	$84,162,061	5	$21,150,000	1	$2,830,000	21	$21,883,403	5	$5,900,000	530	$456,447,821
Other Utilities	51	$44,529,864	4	$4,400,000	0	$0	0	$0	2	$1,950,000	28	$369,847,537	85	$420,727,401
Law Enforcement	80	$237,246,678	47	$150,454,075	0	$0	0	$0	4	$5,899,999	0	$0	131	$393,600,752
Industrial Sites/Parks	99	$112,489,000	81	$168,637,895	0	$0	0	$0	18	$51,934,500	20	$29,260,000	218	$362,321,395
Libraries/Museums	37	$199,274,000	35	$55,748,571	0	$0	0	$0	12	$55,171,022	2	$597,000	86	$310,790,593
Stormwater	112	$210,598,500	7	$71,787,868	0	$0	0	$0	4	$6,585,000	0	$0	123	$288,971,368
Business District Development	39	$257,340,869	0	$0	0	$0	0	$0	4	$800,000	1	$0	44	$258,140,869
Navigation	0	$0	0	$0	0	$0	1	$250,000,000	0	$0	0	$0	1	$250,000,000
Non K-12 Education	2	$9,000,000	5	$2,482,543	2	$101,400,000	0	$0	2	$17,876,000	2	$1,000,000	13	$131,758,543
Community Development	19	$114,727,327	1	$500,000	0	$0	0	$0	1	$3,500,000	0	$0	21	$118,727,327
Housing	53	$43,141,900	22	$15,417,500	0	$0	0	$0	25	$23,000,500	35	$34,092,000	135	$115,651,900
Telecommunications	77	$80,152,000	9	$11,160,930	0	$0	0	$0	14	$12,860,000	1	$0	101	$104,172,930
Fire Protection	173	$83,921,171	20	$6,728,950	0	$0	0	$0	4	$1,800,000	4	$5,980,000	201	$98,430,121
Solid Waste	75	$55,345,766	51	$24,627,500	0	$0	0	$0	6	$6,002,500	3	$150,000	135	$86,125,766
Other Facilities	37	$44,297,462	19	$16,560,934	0	$0	0	$0	1	$150,000	4	$740,000	61	$61,748,396
Property Acquisition	6	$25,725,000	1	$300,000	0	$0	0	$0	0	$0	1	$35,000,000	8	$61,025,000
Public Health Facilities	48	$27,472,750	32	$23,032,000	0	$0	0	$0	4	$1,825,000	1	$500,000	85	$52,829,750
Total	3,120	$5,139,068,810	807	$1,529,411,120	273	$2,890,427,000	4	$253,130,000	227	$483,603,076	516	$879,132,670	4,947	$11,154,772,676

*Joint: Ownership of reported needs by any combination of public agencies at multiple levels of government or a in partnership with the private sector.

**Other: Ownership of reported needs by an independent public entity that is not identified with a specific level of government or publicly funded needs that are owned by the private sector. (This includes most utility district needs, as well as privately owned needs such as low and moderate income housing rehabilitation to be funded with public monies.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3
General Infrastructure Projects
Cost and Percentage of Projects by Type Reported in a Capital Improvement Plan

Type of Project	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects	Percent of Cost by Type reported in a CIP
Transportation	459	$1,528,990,062	34.0%
Water and Wastewater	520	$1,353,893,733	51.4%
Other Utilities	42	$383,331,112	91.1%
Public Buildings	114	$292,253,656	63.8%
Law Enforcement	53	$286,575,897	72.8%
Recreation	263	$265,020,661	58.1%
Libraries and Museums	33	$263,759,593	84.9%
Stormwater	81	$254,775,368	88.2%
Business District Development	24	$251,916,000	97.6%
Navigation	1	$250,000,000	100.0%
Community Development	18	$113,170,327	95.3%
Telecommunications	42	$76,902,930	73.8%
Industrial Sites and Parks	39	$67,327,000	18.6%
Fire Protection	84	$60,781,950	61.8%
Property Acquisition	6	$60,425,000	99.0%
Solid Waste	32	$48,273,500	56.1%
Other Facilities	33	$44,652,934	72.3%
Public Health Facilities	25	$36,414,750	68.9%
Housing	12	$18,648,000	16.1%
Non K-12 Education	3	$14,658,543	11.1%
Statewide Totals	**1,884**	**$5,671,771,016**	**50.8%**

correlation to local government CIPs. At least 1,884 projects identified in this survey are derived from a CIP. These projects reflect a cost of almost $5.7 billion dollars or about one-half of the total costs of all reported projects. This includes 38.1 percent of all general infrastructure projects.

Project data from 77 cities was collected that reports inclusion in a local government CIP. The survey found 1,615 projects (32.6 percent of all general infrastructure projects) that are located within a municipality and are included in a local CIP. This represents a cost of $4,985,460,580 (44 percent of all projects). Likewise, 269 projects located in unincorporated areas (5.4 percent of all general infrastructure projects) are included in a local CIP and total to a cost of $686,310,436 (5.4% of all projects).

However, because a project is not derived from a CIP does not mean that it should be discounted. Since the Infrastructure Act did not direct staff to rely solely on CIP data. The infrastructure legislation specifically states that the TACIR must consult with the appropriate local and state officials concerning planned and anticipated needs during the compilation of the public infrastructure needs inventory.[6]

Stage of Development

To better assess the significance and the investment made in a project to date, the TACIR survey requests local officials to identify the "stage of development" for each project with the following criteria:

- The project is in a "conceptual" stage, it is an idea or concept;
- The project is in a "planning and/or design stage; or
- The project is actually in the construction phase.

Table 4 shows the general infrastructure needs reported by their stage of development. As displayed in the table, of the total 4,947 general infrastructure projects:

Table 4
General Infrastructure Needs by Stage of Development

	CONCEPTUAL			PLANNING AND DESIGN			CONSTRUCTION			TOTAL		
Type of Project	No. of Projects	Cost of Projects	Percent of Cost by Type	No. of Projects	Cost of Projects	Percent of Cost by Type	No. of Projects	Cost of Projects	Percent of Cost by Type	No. of Projects	Cost of Projects	Percent of Cost by Type
Transportation	741	$3,361,399,279	74.8%	263	$921,533,994	20.5%	88	$208,584,650	4.6%	1092	$4,491,517,923	40.3%
Water/Wastewater	1010	$1,901,420,060	72.2%	405	$514,583,257	19.5%	123	$217,703,344	8.3%	1538	$2,633,706,661	23.6%
Public Buildings	231	$208,413,857	45.5%	71	$191,664,029	41.8%	37	$58,000,274	12.7%	339	$458,078,160	4.1%
Recreation	323	$291,561,080	63.9%	152	$125,326,300	27.5%	55	$39,560,441	8.7%	530	$456,447,821	4.1%
Other Utilities	63	$401,980,537	95.5%	16	$12,323,575	2.9%	6	$6,423,289	1.5%	85	$420,727,401	3.8%
Law Enforcement	97	$286,307,947	72.7%	21	$78,559,730	20.0%	13	$28,733,075	7.3%	131	$393,600,752	3.5%
Industrial Sites/Parks	136	$206,521,645	57.0%	66	$141,096,750	38.9%	16	$14,703,000	4.1%	218	$362,321,395	3.2%
Libraries/Museums	55	$229,560,000	73.9%	24	$64,235,593	20.7%	7	$16,995,000	5.5%	86	$310,790,593	2.8%
Stormwater	75	$170,221,000	58.9%	27	$63,717,000	22.0%	21	$55,033,368	19.0%	123	$288,971,368	2.6%
Business District Development	28	$189,008,000	73.2%	13	$58,085,869	22.5%	3	$11,047,000	4.3%	44	$258,140,869	2.3%
Navigation	0	$0	0.0%	1	$250,000,000	100.0%	0	$0	0.0%	1	$250,000,000	2.2%
Non K-12 Education	8	$115,500,000	87.7%	3	$1,720,000	1.3%	2	$14,538,543	11.0%	13	$131,758,543	1.2%
Community Development	15	$107,689,000	90.7%	1	$2,625,000	2.2%	5	$8,413,327	7.1%	21	$118,727,327	1.1%
Housing	89	$89,227,500	77.2%	30	$18,366,400	15.9%	16	$8,058,000	7.0%	135	$115,651,900	1.0%
Telecommunications	82	$77,859,000	74.7%	13	$12,593,000	12.1%	6	$13,720,930	13.2%	101	$104,172,930	0.9%
Fire Protection	138	$73,823,171	75.0%	48	$19,226,450	19.5%	15	$5,380,500	5.5%	201	$98,430,121	0.9%
Solid Waste	90	$44,515,000	51.7%	30	$26,969,000	31.3%	15	$14,641,766	17.0%	135	$86,125,766	0.8%
Other Facilities	38	$51,863,462	84.0%	14	$6,565,000	10.6%	9	$3,319,934	5.4%	61	$61,748,396	0.6%
Property Acquisition	6	$58,375,000	95.7%	2	$2,650,000	4.3%	0	$0	0.0%	8	$61,025,000	0.5%
Public Health Facilities	69	$32,665,000	61.8%	4	$800,000	1.5%	12	$19,364,750	36.7%	85	$52,829,750	0.5%
	3,294	$7,897,910,538	70.8%	1,204	$2,512,640,947	22.5%	449	$744,221,191	6.7%	4,947	$11,154,772,676	100.0%

- 3,294 (70.8 percent) are in the conceptual stage;
- 1,204 (22.5 percent) are in the planning and design stage; and
- 449 (6.7 percent) are in the construction phase.

Mandates

The General Survey Form also requests those surveyed to report whether or not the infrastructure was needed in order to comply with a government mandate or regulation. If so, respondents are asked to cite the "origin" of the mandate, rule or regulation. Table 5 shows needed infrastructure projects resulting from mandates and the associated cost as reported in our survey. The table shows that 262 projects at a cost of $402,390,300 could be attributed to federal regulations, state regulations, or both. Water and wastewater projects account for most of the individual mandate-related projects, and the total cost of all reported mandate-related projects. The 143 water and wastewater projects represent 54.6 percent of all such projects while the cost, $235 million represents 58.5 percent of the $402 million in mandated projects.

It is the opinion of TACIR staff that the number of projects and cost of those projects resulting from mandates may be seriously under reported. The water and wastewater category of infrastructure can be used to illustrate staff's concern. In the General Infrastructure Survey, water and wastewater projects accounted for 1,538 or 31.1 percent of the 4,947 projects reported to the TACIR. These same projects accounted for $2.6 billion or 23.6 percent of the total cost of $11 billion for all general infrastructure projects. However, the reported number of water and wastewater projects that result from a mandate is only 9.3 percent of all reported water and wastewater projects. The cost of the mandated projects, $235 million, represents only 9.3 percent of the total cost of $2.5 billion for all water and wastewater projects.

Because of the large number of federal and state water and wastewater regulations which impose mandates, TACIR staff expects that the actual number of projects related to mandates should be higher. Also while conducting the survey, development district staff reported to the TACIR that many local officials were confused about what constituted a mandate, as well as the regulatory source of mandated needs.

Table 5
Projects Reporting Mandates by Type of Project

	Level of Government of the Regulation Requiring Compliance							
	Federal Regulations		State Regulations		Federal & State Regulations		Total	
Type of Project	No. of Projects	Cost	No. of Projects	Cost	No. of Projects	Cost	No. of Projects	Cost
Water/Wastewater	21	$66,639,000	117	$152,259,534	5	$16,480,000	143	$235,378,534
Solid Waste	2	$200,000	33	$36,469,766	1	$170,000	36	$36,839,766
Housing	2	$5,070,000	6	$27,150,000	0	$0	8	$32,220,000
Stormwater	12	$28,100,000	1	$200,000	0	$0	13	$28,300,000
Other Facilities	4	$17,330,000	1	$150,000	0	$0	5	$17,480,000
Transportation	2	$1,925,000	23	$9,575,000	3	$3,400,000	28	$14,900,000
Law Enforcement	8	$21,955,000	0	$0	0	$0	8	$21,955,000
Public Buildings	9	$12,640,000	0	$0	0	$0	9	$12,640,000
Recreation	4	$1,150,000	2	$552,000	0	$0	6	$1,702,000
Public Health	1	$500,000	0	$0	0	$0	1	$500,000
Other Utilities	0	$0	3	$250,000	0	$0	3	$250,000
Fire Protection	0	$0	1	$175,000	0	$0	1	$175,000
Libraries/Museums	1	$50,000	0	$0	0	$0	1	$50,000
Total	66	$155,559,000	187	$226,781,300	9	$20,050,000	262	$402,309,300

PART II

K-12 Education Infrastructure Needs

The Public Infrastructure Needs Inventory Act passed by the Tennessee General Assembly in 1996, directed the Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to be the lead agency for the conduct of a statewide assessment of public infrastructure needs. Such an activity had never before been attempted in Tennessee. K-12 public education facilities are included as a part of a core group of public infrastructure categories mandated for assessment in the Public Infrastructure Needs Inventory Act.

To accomplish an assessment of education infrastructure needs, each of Tennessee's 1,580 public K-12 schools are surveyed with the assistance of the state's nine development districts.

The survey form used in this process, the FY 1998 Education Survey Form was developed by the TACIR in consultation with the Tennessee Organization of School Superintendents; the Superintendents Study Council; and other education officials in Tennessee, as well as other states. In addition, survey questions included in two General Accounting Office (GAO) reports were adapted for TACIR's survey.

The K-12 Public Education Survey Form was developed to capture the following information:

- General information necessary to identify the location of the school, grade levels served, and its parent school system;
- Current campus conditions and the costs associated to improve the physical condition of the campus; and
- Future campus needs and the costs of those needs.

A copy of the Education Survey Form is included in Appendix 2-A of this report.

Also, a General Survey Form is included in each superintendent's packet to capture all K-12 education facility needs that apply to:

- new school construction;
- more than one school;
- administrative facilities (e.g., central office, bus garage);
- an entire system; or
- joint ventures with another school system.

Copies of these forms were distributed by the development districts' staff to each school superintendent beginning the last week of February 1998. It is the responsibility of each superintendent to disseminate these forms to individual schools in his or her system. School superintendents are asked to complete the forms and return them to their respective development district office. Staffs of the state's nine development districts are directed to be in contact with the school superintendents in their districts to provide assistance and collect the completed surveys.

Each development district office is responsible for entering the raw data into the survey database for processing. During June 1998 each development district submitted the data from their region for statewide compilation and assessment.

For the FY1998 survey, the TACIR has received completed education facilities needs assessments from each of the 138 public school districts. To date, our survey has collected facility conditions or needs

from over 99 percent of the state's 1,580 public schools. See Appendix 2-B for a listing of school systems by county.

Prior Estimates of Education Infrastructure Needs

In 1996, the General Accounting Office (GAO) published two reports that would provide insight into the types of questions and concerns that should be included in TACIR's survey of public education facilities. In *School Facilities: America's Schools Report Differing Conditions* the GAO focuses on determining the amount of funding needed to improve inadequate facilities, the overall condition of schools, and the prevalence of schools that needed major repairs.[7] The second report, *School Facilities: Profiles of School Conditions by State,* the GAO organizes information into profiles for each state showing:

- the percent of schools with inadequate facilities;
- technology needs, and
- the financial impact of complying with specific federal mandates.

The GAO estimates that America's investment in its schools needs to be increased by about $112 billion from 1996 to 1999 to repair or upgrade facilities to a "good" condition and to comply with federal mandates. The GAO report notes that federal mandates account for approximately 10 percent of the $112 billion in estimated costs. Unfortunately, the GAO was unable to produce specific numbers explaining what amount of $112 billion relates to the needs of school facilities in Tennessee.[8] The survey questions developed by the TACIR would address these and other issues for each K-12 public school in Tennessee.

The FY1998 Education Survey Form

The FY1998 Education Survey Form was designed with two main sections

- current campus conditions; and
- future campus needs.

Current Campus Conditions

The TACIR Education Survey Form requests several responses concerning the overall school campus and its component parts. We ask each school to rate its overall condition using the following Facility Rating Scale:

Excellent:	new or easily restorable to "like new" condition; minimal routine maintenance required.
Good:	some routine and preventive maintenance or minor repair required.
Fair:	fails to meet building code or functional requirements in some cases (facility problems are inconvenient); extensive corrective maintenance and repair required.
Poor:	consistent substandard performance (facility problems are disruptive and very costly); fails most building code or functional requirements, requires constant attention, renovation, or replacement; major corrective repair or overhaul required.
Replace:	significantly substandard performance; replacement required.

Using this same rating scale, we request each K-12 public school to rate the following components of their facility:

- Regular Classrooms (Permanent)
- Regular Classrooms (Portable)
- Science Labs
- Auditorium
- Cafeteria
- Library/Media Center
- Restrooms
- Vocational/Industrial Arts Labs and Shops
- Administrative & Support Offices/ Workspace
- Health/First Aid Room
- Indoor Physical Ed. Facilities/Gymnasium
- Outdoor Playground Area
- Auxiliary Support Buildings

Each school is queried to estimate the total cost of repairs, renovations and modernizations to put the school in at least a "good" overall condition over the next five years.

Mandates

The TACIR survey also inquires about the costs associated with the school making improvements to comply with federal and state mandates. The state mandates do not include those associated with the requirements of the Education Improvement Act of 1992 (EIA). Costs associated with EIA requirements are addressed in a later section of the survey. The mandates addressed in the TACIR survey are those associated with:

- the Americans with Disabilities Act;
- asbestos management/correction;
- lead in water/paint;
- underground storage tanks;
- radon management;
- Other (Federal); and
- Other (State).

The State of Tennessee mandates do not include those associated with the requirements of the Education Improvement Act of 1992 (EIA). Costs associated with EIA requirements are addressed in a later section of the survey.

Technology

The survey asks each school to identify the use of the following technological resources:

- Internet
- Local Area Network
- Fiber Optic Cable
- Integrated Services Digital Network (ISDN)
- Distance Learning/Instruction

In addition, the survey requests a description of current technology needs and their estimated costs.

Future Campus Needs and the Education Improvement Act of 1992

The final section of the TACIR Education Survey seeks data concerning total facility needs, in square feet, for anticipated changes in student enrollment. The survey also asks the following questions about the Education Improvement Act of 1992 (EIA):

- If the class size requirement in the EIA were in effect in the 1998-1999 school year, would this school be in compliance?

- How many additional classrooms will this school need to comply with the EIA during the next five years?

- Please give your best estimate of the total cost for each classroom and facility addition needed to comply with the EIA over the next five years.

The FY 1998 General Survey Form

Because the Education Survey Form is designed to capture needs that are unique to an existing school campus, the General Survey Form is used to capture school system facility needs that were not associated with a single existing school campus. This form allows superintendents a simpler method to report new school and system-wide needs. The General Survey Form captures information for each need as a separate project. The form requests the following information for each project:

- location;
- cost;
- status of and the timeframe for completion;
- ownership;
- potential funding sources;
- federal or state mandates that drive the project; and
- a description of the project's significance or impact on the community it serves.

The dollar figures in the survey are taken directly from survey report filed by the individual schools and school systems throughout the state. It is the responsibility of each school or LEA to determine its own cost estimates, using available resources. Table 6 shows by percent how and/or where the schools and LEAs calculate the costs for the individual needs.

The remainder of this report addresses the information we have gleaned from the surveys.

Survey Results

A detailed breakdown of infrastructure needs for each LEA is provided in Appendix 2.

The total reported cost of K-12 public education needs over the next five years is $2.5 billion. Table 7 provides a comprehensive breakdown of the reported cost of all K-12 Education Infrastructure

Table 7
Summary of Education Infrastructure Needs Inventory Cost

		(% Total)
Total K-12 Education Infrastructure Needs *(Sum of Existing School-based Needs and System-wide Needs and New School Construction)*	$2,520,422,533	(100.0%)
❑ **Needs at Existing Schools**	$1,735,816,096	(68.9%)
▪ EIA Compliance for Existing Schools (additional buildings at existing schools)	$393,139,022	(15.6%)
▪ Other Needs at Existing Facilities	$1,342,677,074	(53.3%)
➢ Repair/Renovations	$1,004,165,795	(39.8%)
➢ Existing School Mandate Compliance	$91,791,650	(3.6%)
➢ Current Technology	$246,719,629	(9.8%)
❑ **System-wide Needs & New School Construction**	$784,606,437	(31.1%)
▪ Total System-wide EIA needs	$517,689,310	(20.5%)
❑ **Education Improvement Act Reported Compliance Cost**		
▪ Existing Schools	$393,139,022	
▪ System-wide Needs & New Schools	$517,689,310	
TOTAL	$910,828,332	(36.1% of total)

Source: TACIR Infrastructure Database.

Needs in Tennessee. A total cost of infrastructure needs by school system is shown in Appendix 2-C.

System-wide Needs and New School Construction Cost was reported by LEA system administrators, separate from existing school-based needs. 64 school systems reported 118 system-wide or new school construction projects at a total cost of $784,606,437 (31.1 percent) of all reported K-12 education infrastructure needs. See Appendix 2-D for a breakdown of the cost of these needs for each LEA reporting in this category.

Needs at Existing Schools Cost is composed of the reported cost of infrastructure needs related to the existing facilities and the cost of the construction or acquisition of additional facilities on an existing school's campus. Appendix 2-E displays this cost for each LEA.

The Other Needs at Existing Facilities Cost reflects the total reported cost to bring all existing school facilities up to a "good" condition (repair costs), comply with federal and state mandates, and implement new learning technology is $1,342,677,074 (excluding EIA compliance costs).

EIA Compliance Cost for Existing Schools is separated here for analysis, since the needs reported will involve the construction or acquisition of additional facilities on an existing school's campus. A portion of the total cost of EIA compliance is included in the system-wide needs and new school construction cost. This is addressed later in this document.

Overall Existing Conditions

Although the state's schools report their main buildings have an average age of 34.9 years, the overall condition of Tennessee's school facilities are rated as "Good" (some routine and preventive maintenance required).

Table 8 provides a breakdown of responses by the overall condition rating reported. See Appendix 2-F for a listing of the average age of the main campus building and overall condition of existing schools for each LEA.

Table 8
Overall Condition of Schools State-wide by Condition

Rate of Condition	Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools
Excellent	213	13.5%
Good	723	45.8%
Fair	496	31.4%
Poor	113	7.2%
Replace	33	2.1%
No response	2	0.1%
Total	1,580	100.0%

The costs of repairs, renovations and modernizations to bring all components of the schools in Tennessee up to at least a "good" condition came to $1,004,165,795 over the next five years. This type of need is reported by 1,018 schools across the state.

Although the 1,018 schools reporting these renovation/repair needs may overlap with the schools listing an overall "excellent" or "good" or rate of condition, one or more components of the given schools (e.g. a gymnasium, cafeteria, classroom wing) may be in need of renovation or repair. Additionally, development district staff reported that many local school officials were reluctant to rate a school's overall condition "fair" or worse despite renovations or repairs that were needed for one component of the school.

One question that may arise is "why is the cost of repairs or renovations so great, if the overall ratings of the schools and their components are mostly "excellent" or "good"?" There are two possible explanations for this trend. First, as indicated above, many school officials seemed reluctant to rate their schools'

overall condition as "fair" or worse, therefore the overall ratings are mostly "excellent" or "good". Second, when making "requests" for repairs or renovations, many officials are eager to list all possible needs that they anticipate, increasing the number of projects listed as "needed to bring the schools up to a "good" condition". However, technically, if the schools are in "good" condition, no repairs should be needed to return the school to an "excellent" or "good" condition. Despite this, many administrators listed major maintenance costs for their schools. This is a fault of the survey instrument and it's organization. To prevent confusion over this in subsequent years, the survey instrument must be modified to allow inclusion of major routine and preventative facility maintenance needs (e.g. the replacement of a roof).

Table 9
Number of Classrooms by Condition

	Regular Classrooms (Permanent)		Regular Classrooms (Portable)	
Rate of Condition	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Excellent	11,405	27.6%	219	10.0%
Good	20,879	50.6%	895	40.7%
Fair	6,623	17.0%	607	26.6%
Poor	1,715	4.2%	344	15.7%
Replace	643	1.6%	133	6.1%
Total	41,265	100.0%	2,198	100.0%

Table 10
Component Facility Condition Rating

Component Facility	Percent of components reported as being in "excellent" or "good" condition
Administrative and Support Offices/Workspace	81.2%
Health/First Aid Room	78.8%
Library/Media Center	76.3%
Vocational/Industrial Arts Labs and Shops	76.0%
Science Labs	74.3%
Cafeteria	73.0%
Outdoor Playground Area	72.9%
Indoor Physical Ed. Facilities/Gymnasium	72.0%
Restrooms	68.0%
Auxiliary Support Buildings	65.1%
Auditorium	64.5%

A more detailed examination of the condition of the major facility components at schools across the state reveals that they are in generally good condition. Perhaps the most critical of each school facility's components and learning environments is the classrooms. According to schools officials, 78.2 percent of the 41,265 permanent classrooms reported from across Tennessee are in "excellent" or "good" condition. However, barely half of the 2,198 portable classrooms reported were rated as being in "excellent or good" condition. Table 9 provides a break down by each rate of condition.

The majority of the other component facilities in Tennessee's schools are rated as being in "excellent" or "good" condition. Table 10 shows the percentage of these component facilities for all reporting schools rated as "excellent" or "good".

Mandates

Tennessee schools must comply with a variety of Federal and state mandates in their daily operation. These mandates have been established to ensure the quality and safety of the buildings in which our students

are educated. Currently, 585 schools (37.0 percent) statewide report a facility need that is mandate related. These mandated needs will require our schools to spend a total of $91,791,650 over the next five years. For a listing of these needs by LEA see Appendix 2-H.

Of this total reported cost of mandate compliance, $85,498,350 (93.1 percent) is the result of federally mandated needs. Meanwhile the remaining cost of $1,496,300 (6.9 percent) is the result of needs mandated by the State of Tennessee. These needs do not include the cost of compliance with the EIA, which is addressed later in this report.

Table 11 shows some of the specific mandates and their reported costs. The five mandates that are specifically reported will allow for comparison to General Accounting Office (GAO) studies at a later date.

By far, the most expensive mandate to LEAs is the American's with Disabilities Act, for a cost of $56,886,360 (62.0 percent of all reported mandate costs). The 3 schools reporting "Other: Federal" mandates reported are Title 1 related needs $249,750 (0.3 percent of total mandate costs).

Meanwhile, the most expensive state mandated needs is fire code regulations. Over 90.1 percent of the reported state-mandated needs is related to fire code compliance, totaling $5,672,000. The second notable group of state-mandated needs is special education related mandates. These needs total $586,300 (9.4 percent of state-mandated needs). The remaining unspecified state mandated needs total $35,000, or less than one percent of state-mandated needs.

The over $91 million dollars that LEAs should spend to comply with the above mentioned mandates represents 3.6 percent of the cost of all reported K-12 education infrastructure needs.

Technology

Computers and current technology must be made available to all students in Tennessee's schools to keep up with ever changing technology. Based on the response of 1422 schools, or 90 percent, to

Table 11
Number of Reported Mandate Compliance Needs and Related Costs
By Mandate

Mandate	Number of Schools Reporting Needs	Total Reported Mandate Cost	Percentage of Total Reported Mandate Cost
ADA	452	$56,886,360	62.0%
Asbestos	321	22,796,482	8%
Lead	15	222,758	[illegible]
Radon	107	3,484,000	3.8%
Undrgrd. Stor. Tanks	22	1,829,000	2.0%
Other: Federal	3	279,750	0.3%
Other: State	140	6,293,300	6.9%
Total Cost		**$91,791,650**	**100.0%**

this part of the survey, the current accessibility of technology resources to Tennessee's students is as follows in Table 12:

Table 12
Availability of Technology Resources in Each School for Student Use

Technology Resources	Percent of All Schools
Internet	85.5%
Integrated Services Digital Network (ISDN)	61.3%
Local Area Network (LAN)	55.8%
Fiber Optic Cable	13.9%
Distance Learning/ Instruction	7.6%

To meet the increasing technical demands on students as they enter the workforce, 1,145 schools report technology needs in this survey. According to the school administrators that completed our survey, fulfilling these needs will require $246,719,629. These needs include the provision of computer hardware (e.g. processors, monitors, printers, networking equipment, etc.), and computer software (e.g. programs for word processing, language and math teaching, graphic arts, research, etc.) Appendix 2-I provides a listing of these needs by LEA.

Although these reported technology needs will require an expenditure over $246 million, these costs account for only 9.8 percent of the total K-12 education infrastructure needs.

Future Campus Facilities and EIA Compliance

The Education Improvement Act of 1992 requires all schools in the State of Tennessee to reduce their class sizes, and hence their student-teacher ratios to improve the quality of education being provided to students in Tennessee. In order to meet the class size regulations, schools must have the classroom space to accommodate the increased number of students per school. Also, related facilities (e.g. restrooms, storage areas, workspaces) are often required when additional classrooms are added to an existing facility. Therefore, many schools in Tennessee will require new construction or additions to existing schools to meet the EIA requirements over the next five years (school years 1997-98 through 2002-03).

The EIA cost sub-component was singled out for analysis for a number of reasons. First, lawmakers, educators, and policymakers must know and understand the compliance costs for the EIA. Second, the needs reported will involve both the construction or acquisition of additional facilities on an existing school's campus or on an entirely new school campus.

Currently, only 1,057 of the responding schools, (66.8 percent) are in full compliance with EIA. According to the survey, additional classroom space is currently needed in at least 504 schools (31.9 percent) that are not in compliance. A total of 19 schools (1.2 percent) failed to respond to this question. Due to the critical nature of this information, these responses were verified in the summer of 1998 by TACIR and the development districts. Table 13 displays the status of compliance to the EIA.

Table 13
EIA Compliance as Reported by Schools

Response	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools
Comply	1,057	66.9%
Not Complying	504	31.9%
Not Responding	19	1.2%
Total	1,580	100.0%

Over the next five years, an additional 682 schools will need new classroom space or other related facilities to comply with the EIA. This will include the addition of 4,071 new classrooms, and other related school

facilities at a cost of $393,193,022. Table 14 shows the number of additional classrooms required by schools for EIA compliance by status of compliance.

Table 14
Number of Classrooms Required for EIA Compliance over the next 5 years
(by Current EIA Compliance as Reported by Schools)

Current Reported EIA Compliance Status	Additional Classrooms Required
Complying Schools	1,228
Non-Complying Schools	2,835
Non-Responding Schools	8
Total	4,071

Appendix 2-J shows the number of additional classrooms required to comply with the EIA by LEA as reported by school officials.

The total cost of EIA compliance over the next five years is listed in Table 15. However, no cost estimate was provided by school administrators at 109 schools that reported 654 of these additional classrooms. Due to the failure by school administrators to respond to this question or provide cost estimates the actual cost is higher than the cost reported in Table 15.

Table 15
EIA Compliance Cost

EIA Compliance Need	Cost
Existing Schools	$393,139,022
System-wide Needs and New School Construction	$517,689,310
Total Cost of All EIA Compliance Needs	$910,828,332

When the cost of new school construction and system-wide needs directly related to EIA compliance over the next five years is included, the EIA Compliance needs represent over one-third (36.1 percent) of all reported K-12 education infrastructure needs. The EIA Compliance cost reported by each LEA is listed in Appendix 2-K.

Conclusion

The significance of this report is more than the number of projects reported or the cost to complete these infrastructure needs. This report marks the culmination of the first-ever process of assessing on a statewide basis, the infrastructure needs of local communities and their governments in Tennessee. Also, based on the research of TACIR staff, this is the most comprehensive assessment on a statewide basis to date in the nation.

This survey has led local officials, in many instances for the first time to examine the physical infrastructure needs in their community, over a five-year period. This report provides information that is crucial to the continuing development of each community in Tennessee. The economic stability of our state relies on a system of infrastructure that requires ongoing maintenance and updating to meet the increasing demands of the businesses, families, and governments that utilize its resources. Further, a system to determine the needs of each community is necessary to provide guidance in funding projects with a finite budget. In a similar manner, community needs must be considered in land use and growth management, in light of a growing population and a finite amount of land available for development or conservation. Therefore, a commitment to constantly improve the quality of the available infrastructure is essential to the future of Tennessee.

---

[1] Tennessee Code Annotated § 4-10-109 (a).
[2] FY 1998 Infrastructure Needs Inventory TACIR - Development Districts Contract.
[3] Tennessee Code Annotated § 4-10-109 (b).
[4] Tennessee Code Annotated § 4-10-109 (a).
[5] Tennessee Code Annotated § 4-10-109 (a).
[6] Tennessee Code Annotated § 4-10-109 (a).
[7] GAO/HEHS: 96-103. School Facilities: America's Schools Report Differing Conditions. (June 1996).
[8] GAO/HEHS: 96-148. School Facilities: Profiles of School Conditions by State. (June 1996)

Appendix

Appendix 1 *Page*

A **FY 1998 General Survey Form** 27
B **Tennessee Counties by Development District** 29
C **All General Infrastructure** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 30
D **Transportation** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 31
E **Water and Wastewater** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 32
F **Public Buildings** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 33
G **Recreation** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 34
H **Other Utilities** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 35
I **Law Enforcement** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 36
J **Industrial Sites and Parks** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 37
K **Libraries and Museums** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 38
L **Stormwater** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 39
M **Business District Development** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 40
N **Navigation** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 40
O **Non K-12 Education** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 41
P **Community Development** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 41
Q **Housing** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 42
R **Telecommunications** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 43
S **Fire Protection** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 44
T **Solid Waste** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 45
U **Other Facilities** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 46
V **Property Acquisition** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 46
W **Public Health** — Number of Projects and Cost By County 47

Appendix 2

A **FY 1998 Education Survey Form** 48
B **Tennessee School System List By County, FY 1998** 53

Appendix 2 (continued) *Page*

C Total Cost of All Reported K-12 Public Education Infrastructure Needs by LEA 55

D Reported Total Cost of System-Wide Needs and New School Construction by LEA 57

E Reported Total Cost of Infrastructure Needs for Existing Schools by LEA 58

F Age and Condition of Existing Facilities by LEA 60

G Upgrade Cost: Reported Cost of Repairs and Renovations to Bring All Schools in LEA Up to a "Good" Condition 62

H Reported Federal and State Mandate Compliance Cost for Existing Schools by LEA 64

I Reported Total Costs of Current Technology Needs by LEA 66

J Number of Reported Additional Classrooms Required to Comply with Education Improvement Act of 1992 by LEA 68

K Reported Total Cost of All Education Improvement Act of 1992 Compliance Related Infrastructure Needs 70

Appendix 3 Legislative Directive to Study Statewide Public Infrastructure Needs Inventory *72*

Appendix 1-A

State of Tennessee
Infrastructure Needs Inventory Project
FY 1998 General Survey Form

This survey is designed to capture needs and expenditures over a five year period.
If additional space is needed, attach extra sheet(s) as necessary. Please specify question response.

---

1 **Project Number:** _____ -- _____
An 8-digit alpha-numeric field that is unique to this project. It is assigned by the development district for entry into the statewide database.

2 **Development District:** _____
The regional development district that serves this location.

3 **Date:** _____
The date that this form is completed.

4 **County:** _____
The county in which this project is located.

5 **City:** _____
The city or town in which this project is located.
If outside a municipality, record as "unincorporated".
If located in multiple municipalities, list each.

6 **Type of Project:** _____
Cite the best classification for this project: (Education, Fire Protection, Housing, Industrial, Law Enforcement, Libraries & Museums, Public Buildings, Recreation, Solid Waste, Telecommunications, Transportation, Water & Wastewater, Other Facilities, and Other Utilities)

7 **Project Title/ Name** (if applicable): _____
Provide a name by which this project or need may be referenced.

8 **Ownership/ Controlling Entity(ies) of Project:** _____
_____
Indicate who will own, operate, or maintain this project (i.e., the State, a city, a county, a utility district, a local education agency (LEA), other group, or combination of entities). If a LEA, also provide its 3-digit system number.

9 **Location of Project** (if applicable): _____
_____
Cite a geographic location (be as specific as possible), such as street address, or proximity to a landmark such as a street, intersection, or body of water. If necessary, state a general area served by this project, such as a portion of a city, county, or multiple jurisdictions.

10 **Status/ Stage of Project:** _____
(Conceptual, Planning & Design, or Construction)
Indicate the current stage of development of this project. Choose from the following stages:

Conceptual: This project is an idea or concept.
Planning & Design: This project is on paper and has received significant analysis.
Construction: This project has moved earth, poured concrete, or erected part of the structure.

11 **Projected FY Start Date:** _____ ***12*** **Projected FY Completion Date:** _____
Using the State of Tennessee Fiscal Year (July 1 to June 30), cite the fiscal year (FY) you forecast this project will be initially funded, and when it will be completed and last funded. This excludes on-going operating expenditures. (FY 1999 begins July 1, 1999.)

13 **Is this project listed in a capital improvement plan (CIP)?** (Y/N) _____
If your agency or community has a capital improvement plan, is this project included?

14 **Estimated Cost of Project** (if available): **$** _____
Provide the best estimate available for the total cost of this project.

This form has been slightly modified.

15 List all possible funding sources (if available):

List any agency and its specific program name that has provided financing or may be a potential source of financing for this project. In the appropriate block, indicate the level of government (Federal, State, County, or City) or other group (Other), for each source, and if available, the dollar amount each source has funded or might fund.

If funding from any of these sources has been legally obligated or received, respond "**YES**" in the last column.

Funding Sources

Level of Government	Agency Name	Name of Funding Program	Amount ($)	Funding Secured (Y/N)
Example: Other	*TN Municipal League*	*Tennessee Municipal League Bond Fund*	*$5,000*	*No*

16 Source(s) of cost data (check all that apply):

_____ Inspection by licensed professionals within last 3 years
_____ Capital improvements plan
_____ Work currently under contract
_____ Professional judgment

Other (please specify): _____

17 Is this need a result of a mandate? If applicable, cite the origin of any mandate from which this project resulted:

Level of Government	Agency Name	Rule and Regulation
Example: Federal	*EPA*	*Safe Drinking Water Act*

Provide the level of government (Federal or State), agency name, and its specific program name(s) in the appropriate block. Indicate **"N/A"** in the first row under "**Level of Government**" if this project is not driven by a mandate.

18 Description and significance of infrastructure need: _____

_____

_____

State the purpose and briefly describe this project. Why is this project important? What impact will addressing this need have on the community?

19 Does this need link to other projects in this survey? If yes, cite related project number(s) or name(s) as reported in this survey: _____

20 Information Source(s): _____

_____

Cite anyone contacted or documents that were consulted for information during the completion of this survey form.

21 Surveyor: _____

Signature of the person completing this survey form.

This form has been slightly modified.

Appendix 1-B
Tennessee Counties by Development District

Development Districts	Counties			
East Tennessee Development District	ANDERSON	COCKE	KNOX	ROANE
	BLOUNT	GRAINGER	LOUDON	SCOTT
	CAMPBELL	HAMBLEN	MONROE	SEVIER
	CLAIBORNE	JEFFERSON	MORGAN	UNION
First Tennessee Development District	CARTER	JOHNSON		
	GREENE	SULLIVAN		
	HANCOCK	UNICOI		
	HAWKINS	WASHINGTON		
Greater Nashville Regional Council	CHEATHAM	HUMPHREYS	STEWART	WILSON
	DAVIDSON	MONTGOMERY	SUMNER	
	DICKSON	ROBERTSON	TROUSDALE	
	HOUSTON	RUTHERFORD	WILLIAMSON	
Memphis Area Association of Governments	FAYETTE			
	LAUDERDALE			
	SHELBY			
	TIPTON			
Northwest Tennessee Development District	BENTON	GIBSON	WEAKLEY	
	CARROLL	HENRY		
	CROCKETT	LAKE		
	DYER	OBION		
South Central Tennessee Development District	BEDFORD	HICKMAN	MARSHALL	WAYNE
	COFFEE	LAWRENCE	MAURY	
	FRANKLIN	LEWIS	MOORE	
	GILES	LINCOLN	PERRY	
Southeast Tennessee Development District	BLEDSOE	MCMINN	RHEA	
	BRADLEY	MARION	SEQUATCHIE	
	GRUNDY	MEIGS		
	HAMILTON	POLK		
Southwest Tennessee Development District	CHESTER	HAYWOOD		
	DECATUR	HENDERSON		
	HARDEMAN	MCNAIRY		
	HARDIN	MADISON		
Upper Cumberland Development District	CANNON	FENTRESS	PICKETT	WARREN
	CLAY	JACKSON	PUTNAM	WHITE
	CUMBERLAND	MACON	SMITH	
	DEKALB	OVERTON	VAN BUREN	

Appendix 1-C
All General Infrastructure
Number of Projects and Cost by County

County Name	No. of Projects	Cost of Projects
ANDERSON	8	$7,850,000
BEDFORD	48	$86,565,185
BENTON	8	$3,514,751
BLEDSOE	23	$57,925,000
BLOUNT	8	$1,110,000
BRADLEY	98	$118,885,500
CAMPBELL	48	$61,634,000
CANNON	38	$29,165,000
CARROLL	26	$9,134,950
CARTER	47	$40,038,114
CHEATHAM	51	$129,433,000
CHESTER	18	$6,115,000
CLAIBORNE	35	$39,306,000
CLAY	30	$53,752,000
COCKE	37	$33,222,364
COFFEE	51	$49,345,000
CROCKETT	13	$6,862,000
CUMBERLAND	65	$150,888,005
DAVIDSON	471	$2,634,103,199
DECATUR	18	$13,885,000
DEKALB	49	$108,255,000
DICKSON	49	$338,475,000
DYER	25	$36,678,000
FAYETTE	20	$24,191,575
FENTRESS	26	$48,100,000
FRANKLIN	50	$17,943,145
GIBSON	57	$94,653,350
GILES	47	$28,384,766
GRAINGER	3	$3,620,000
GREENE	64	$46,039,000
GRUNDY	28	$11,025,000
HAMBLEN	20	$51,455,000
HAMILTON	162	$757,674,176
HANCOCK	22	$17,530,000
HARDEMAN	25	$28,104,004
HARDIN	18	$6,134,000
HAWKINS	64	$53,412,300
HAYWOOD	21	$20,809,403
HENDERSON	11	$6,750,000
HENRY	32	$48,656,000
HICKMAN	29	$20,445,000
HOUSTON	31	$122,925,000
HUMPHREYS	47	$129,189,999
JACKSON	55	$83,928,000
JEFFERSON	15	$5,875,000
JOHNSON	41	$29,113,289
KNOX	149	$532,477,771
LAKE	16	$5,287,000
LAUDERDALE	12	$8,486,000
LAWRENCE	57	$7,359,000
LEWIS	17	$8,465,000

County Name	No. of Projects	Cost of Projects
LINCOLN	56	$118,297,000
LOUDON	29	$187,979,000
MCMINN	48	$119,977,000
MCNAIRY	47	$15,411,800
MACON	38	$170,847,500
MADISON	160	$140,472,540
MARION	37	$24,415,000
MARSHALL	51	$14,829,640
MAURY	54	$69,125,750
MEIGS	13	$27,400,000
MONROE	39	$32,894,869
MONTGOMERY	152	$176,364,000
MOORE	8	$15,034,000
MORGAN	6	$10,395,000
OBION	43	$31,854,864
OVERTON	23	$21,710,000
PERRY	18	$8,675,000
PICKETT	36	$37,255,000
POLK	16	$10,525,000
PUTNAM	99	$223,770,000
RHEA	22	$25,511,200
ROANE	46	$44,890,903
ROBERTSON	38	$143,720,000
RUTHERFORD	119	$341,642,801
SCOTT	40	$68,719,493
SEQUATCHIE	10	$6,155,000
SEVIER	77	$153,751,273
SHELBY	250	$471,408,139
SMITH	55	$65,195,000
STEWART	24	$166,344,000
SULLIVAN	189	$220,790,050
SUMNER	96	$326,236,011
TIPTON	12	$7,665,000
TROUSDALE	12	$69,040,000
UNICOI	56	$25,877,152
UNION	18	$55,384,000
VAN BUREN	26	$32,540,000
WARREN	70	$202,925,471
WASHINGTON	128	$220,895,974
WAYNE	39	$15,733,000
WEAKLEY	26	$14,996,400
WHITE	39	$62,625,000
WILLIAMSON	126	$164,069,000
WILSON	53	$557,250,000
Statewide Total	**4,947**	**$11,154,772,676**

Appendix 1-D
Transportation — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BEDFORD	7	$275,000
BLEDSOE	5	$40,000,000
BRADLEY	32	$32,825,000
CAMPBELL	8	$21,724,000
CANNON	7	$20,800,000
CARROLL	1	$100,000
CARTER	10	$1,324,114
CHEATHAM	14	$78,180,000
CHESTER	3	$300,000
CLAY	5	$43,000,000
CLAIBORNE	6	$15,450,000
COCKE	5	$6,600,000
COFFEE	14	$8,770,000
CROCKETT	1	$120,000
CUMBERLAND	14	$81,570,000
DAVIDSON	103	$453,569,999
DECATUR	4	$5,250,000
DEKALB	12	$85,660,000
DICKSON	30	$288,580,000
DYER	2	$4,030,000
FAYETTE	2	$4,500,000
FENTRESS	6	$39,600,000
FRANKLIN	7	$362,000
GIBSON	9	$67,857,000
GILES	8	$6,840,000
GREENE	5	$1,300,000
GRUNDY	4	$1,450,000
HAMBLEN	3	$2,050,000
HAMILTON	61	$289,839,576
HANCOCK	3	$11,650,000
HARDEMAN	4	$750,000
HARDIN	2	not reported
HAWKINS	12	$14,285,000
HAYWOOD	1	not reported
HENDERSON	1	not reported
HENRY	4	$4,120,000
HICKMAN	7	$3,550,000
HOUSTON	7	$108,550,000
HUMPHREYS	10	$101,675,000
JACKSON	13	$49,960,000
JEFFERSON	2	$500,000
JOHNSON	5	$2,690,000
KNOX	47	$170,373,900
LAUDERDALE	2	$856,000
LAWRENCE	18	$3,500,000
LEWIS	6	$2,315,000
LINCOLN	13	$79,775,000
LOUDON	9	$109,200,000
MCMINN	10	$96,255,000
MCNAIRY	9	$525,000
MACON	8	$122,560,000
MADISON	17	$21,322,980
MARION	4	$450,000
MARSHALL	18	$2,463,640
MAURY	17	$6,310,000
MEIGS	4	$22,850,000
MONROE	6	$1,650,000
MONTGOMERY	28	$26,367,000
MOORE	2	$50,000
OBION	2	$3,926,667
OVERTON	7	$12,100,000
PERRY	6	$4,125,000
PICKETT	10	$11,840,000
PUTNAM	27	$183,050,000
RHEA	2	$2,600,000
ROANE	3	$2,200,000
ROBERTSON	12	$114,475,000
RUTHERFORD	36	$112,100,000
SCOTT	5	$1,150,000
SEVIER	14	$67,224,600
SHELBY	72	$208,727,487
SMITH	14	$38,600,000
STEWART	7	$145,814,000
SULLIVAN	42	$42,617,000
SUMNER	34	$249,802,460
TIPTON	1	$2,500,000
TROUSDALE	2	$43,000,000
UNICOI	7	$2,383,000
UNION	7	$49,850,000
VAN BUREN	3	$5,700,000
WARREN	12	$36,830,000
WASHINGTON	17	$38,687,500
WAYNE	13	$4,225,000
WEAKLEY	1	$75,000
WHITE	5	$11,400,000
WILLIAMSON	30	$106,635,000
WILSON	24	$423,400,000
Statewide Total	**1,092**	**$4,491,517,923**

Appendix 1-E
Water and Wastewater — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
ANDERSON	8	$7,850,000
BEDFORD	21	$58,870,185
BENTON	4	$1,526,751
BLEDSOE	6	$2,750,000
BLOUNT	8	$1,110,000
BRADLEY	46	$33,942,000
CAMPBELL	13	$22,050,000
CANNON	2	$1,000,000
CARROLL	9	$3,603,000
CARTER	22	$27,905,000
CHEATHAM	8	$22,633,000
CHESTER	3	$2,300,000
CLAIBORNE	14	$16,856,000
CLAY	7	$1,742,000
COCKE	12	$9,952,364
COFFEE	21	$20,102,000
CROCKETT	5	$3,785,000
CUMBERLAND	9	$50,190,000
DAVIDSON	98	$702,488,000
DECATUR	5	$2,250,000
DEKALB	7	$11,240,000
DICKSON	5	$35,245,000
DYER	4	$11,650,000
FAYETTE	7	$2,273,000
FENTRESS	2	$3,250,000
FRANKLIN	22	$10,912,000
GIBSON	11	$13,457,350
GILES	19	$15,762,000
GRAINGER	3	$3,620,000
GREENE	34	$20,863,000
GRUNDY	13	$6,050,000
HAMBLEN	12	$42,205,000
HAMILTON	42	$77,780,000
HANCOCK	4	$2,160,000
HARDEMAN	6	$4,654,004
HARDIN	8	$4,687,000
HAWKINS	25	$26,155,300
HAYWOOD	2	$4,800,000
HENDERSON	6	$5,650,000
HENRY	9	$13,814,000
HICKMAN	9	$5,785,000
HOUSTON	10	$7,450,000
HUMPHREYS	13	$4,675,000
JACKSON	14	$14,333,000
JEFFERSON	7	$2,575,000
JOHNSON	21	$16,200,000
KNOX	38	$88,805,650
LAKE	3	$1,700,000
LAUDERDALE	2	$1,000,000
LAWRENCE	19	$2,800,000
LEWIS	5	$4,250,000
LINCOLN	27	$30,765,000
LOUDON	13	$24,100,000
MCMINN	17	$10,420,000
MCNAIRY	16	$7,620,900
MACON	5	$18,145,000
MADISON	104	$95,898,462
MARION	17	$17,240,000
MARSHALL	18	$7,256,000
MAURY	20	$29,032,000
MEIGS	4	$3,000,000
MONROE	14	$18,400,000
MONTGOMERY	46	$94,240,000
MOORE	3	$4,900,000
MORGAN	5	$10,195,000
OBION	11	$17,757,197
OVERTON	1	$280,000
PERRY	7	$2,815,000
PICKETT	3	$3,500,000
POLK	9	$6,200,000
PUTNAM	19	$17,550,000
RHEA	7	$4,311,200
ROANE	30	$31,190,903
ROBERTSON	8	$15,045,000
RUTHERFORD	40	$168,265,738
SCOTT	11	$49,917,493
SEQUATCHIE	7	$5,100,000
SEVIER	43	$51,218,673
SHELBY	38	$26,340,488
SMITH	14	$12,180,000
STEWART	4	$1,625,000
SULLIVAN	80	$114,158,800
SUMNER	24	$47,583,151
TIPTON	3	$2,650,000
TROUSDALE	5	$6,320,000
UNICOI	24	$9,341,152
UNION	6	$3,800,000
VAN BUREN	4	$18,400,000
WARREN	8	$6,850,000
WASHINGTON	32	$53,212,500
WAYNE	10	$5,255,000
WEAKLEY	5	$6,321,400
WHITE	12	$26,275,000
WILLIAMSON	53	$33,624,000
WILSON	8	$56,700,000
Statewide Total	**1538**	**$2,633,706,661**

Appendix 1-F
Public Buildings — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BEDFORD	3	$1,300,000
BLEDSOE	1	$250,000
BRADLEY	6	$14,600,000
CAMPBELL	3	$1,675,000
CANNON	5	$2,070,000
CARROLL	3	$2,060,000
CARTER	1	$180,000
CHEATHAM	8	$9,600,000
CHESTER	3	$2,300,000
CLAIBORNE	2	$300,000
CLAY	2	$400,000
COCKE	2	$400,000
COFFEE	5	$4,743,000
CUMBERLAND	10	$4,228,005
DAVIDSON	34	$64,809,000
DECATUR	2	$135,000
DEKALB	5	$4,725,000
DICKSON	4	$8,850,000
DYER	5	$10,250,000
FAYETTE	1	$230,000
FENTRESS	3	$325,000
FRANKLIN	3	$50,000
GIBSON	5	$1,900,000
GILES	2	$73,500
GREENE	5	$3,480,000
GRUNDY	1	$50,000
HAMBLEN	1	$2,500,000
HAMILTON	4	$1,251,108
HANCOCK	1	$50,000
HARDEMAN	1	$100,000
HAWKINS	5	$7,290,000
HAYWOOD	1	$1,000,000
HENRY	2	$6,307,000
HICKMAN	2	$2,060,000
HOUSTON	3	$900,000
HUMPHREYS	3	$500,000
JACKSON	3	$1,025,000
JEFFERSON	2	$500,000
JOHNSON	2	$1,750,000
KNOX	3	$135,740,000
LAUDERDALE	2	$1,250,000
LAWRENCE	2	not reported
LEWIS	1	$800,000

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
LINCOLN	4	$457,000
MCMINN	6	$3,680,000
MCNAIRY	2	$600,000
MACON	4	$3,850,000
MADISON	2	$117,000
MARION	3	$1,700,000
MARSHALL	2	$1,000,000
MAURY	4	$1,400,000
MONROE	1	$1,000,000
MONTGOMERY	3	$690,000
OBION	6	$1,575,000
OVERTON	4	$3,700,000
PICKETT	3	$1,000,000
POLK	1	$150,000
PUTNAM	12	$8,475,000
RHEA	1	$2,000,000
ROANE	3	$1,600,000
ROBERTSON	6	$3,950,000
RUTHERFORD	4	$3,349,849
SCOTT	3	$600,000
SEVIER	5	$5,165,000
SHELBY	24	$48,099,274
SMITH	5	$5,975,000
STEWART	4	$850,000
SULLIVAN	13	$11,350,750
SUMNER	6	$3,103,400
TROUSDALE	2	$6,550,000
UNICOI	2	$550,000
UNION	2	$500,000
VAN BUREN	3	$1,350,000
WARREN	5	$13,425,000
WASHINGTON	10	$3,749,274
WAYNE	4	$815,000
WEAKLEY	3	$4,050,000
WHITE	4	$2,800,000
WILLIAMSON	8	$2,545,000
WILSON	3	$4,300,000
Total Statewide	339	$458,078,160

Appendix 1-G
Recreation — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BEDFORD	4	$370,000
BENTON	2	$988,000
BLEDSOE	4	$10,170,000
BRADLEY	3	$520,000
CAMPBELL	8	$1,285,000
CANNON	7	$780,000
CARROLL	5	$1,150,000
CARTER	4	$412,000
CHEATHAM	4	$2,950,000
CHESTER	2	$300,000
CLAIBORNE	4	$800,000
CLAY	1	$150,000
COCKE	2	$1,300,000
COFFEE	3	$6,000,000
CROCKETT	2	$450,000
CUMBERLAND	5	$725,000
DAVIDSON	68	$94,328,000
DECATUR	1	$250,000
DEKALB	2	$125,000
DICKSON	3	$3,350,000
DYER	1	$400,000
FENTRESS	1	$50,000
FRANKLIN	6	$434,000
GIBSON	10	$4,070,000
GILES	6	$571,000
GREENE	3	$950,000
GRUNDY	4	$260,000
HAMILTON	8	$4,662,600
HANCOCK	4	$750,000
HARDEMAN	1	not reported
HARDIN	2	$150,000
HAWKINS	6	$970,000
HAYWOOD	6	$2,117,403
HENDERSON	1	$100,000
HENRY	3	$3,350,000
HICKMAN	1	$175,000
HOUSTON	2	$225,000
HUMPHREYS	5	$3,910,000
JOHNSON	5	$3,830,000
KNOX	32	$39,050,320
LAKE	2	$182,000
LAUDERDALE	2	$3,660,000
LAWRENCE	4	$109,000
LEWIS	1	$400,000
LINCOLN	3	$1,050,000
MCMINN	5	$1,100,000
MCNAIRY	6	$1,229,000
MACON	2	$6,500,000
MADISON	6	$1,123,080
MARION	4	$675,000
MARSHALL	4	$550,000
MAURY	2	$650,000
MEIGS	2	$700,000
MONROE	5	$890,000
MONTGOMERY	35	$19,852,000
OBION	7	$1,010,000
OVERTON	1	$150,000
PERRY	1	$60,000
PICKETT	1	$50,000
PUTNAM	5	$450,000
RHEA	1	$250,000
ROANE	4	$2,150,000
ROBERTSON	3	$6,400,000
RUTHERFORD	13	$24,322,677
SCOTT	6	$2,350,000
SEQUATCHIE	1	$55,000
SEVIER	8	$16,518,000
SHELBY	35	$36,542,941
SMITH	3	$700,000
STEWART	5	$13,455,000
SULLIVAN	19	$10,036,000
SUMNER	9	$7,185,000
TIPTON	2	$175,000
TROUSDALE	1	$12,000,000
UNICOI	7	$3,905,000
UNION	1	$84,000
VAN BUREN	2	$150,000
WARREN	7	$6,060,000
WASHINGTON	28	$17,897,800
WAYNE	5	$2,958,000
WEAKLEY	4	$800,000
WHITE	3	$16,300,000
WILLIAMSON	16	$11,185,000
WILSON	8	$32,150,000
Statewide Total	**530**	**$456,447,821**

Appendix 1-H
Other Utilities — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BEDFORD	4	$7,950,000
BENTON	1	$1,000,000
BLEDSOE	1	$180,000
CARTER	1	$5,000,000
CHESTER	1	$100,000
CLAY	1	$1,000,000
COCKE	7	$9,720,000
CROCKETT	1	$150,000
DAVIDSON	4	$346,898,000
DYER	2	$850,000
FAYETTE	3	$3,423,575
FENTRESS	1	$500,000
FRANKLIN	1	not reported
GRUNDY	1	$600,000
JACKSON	1	$750,000
JOHNSON	1	$93,289
LAWRENCE	6	not reported
LEWIS	1	$400,000
MCMINN	1	$250,000
MCNAIRY	1	$500,000
MADISON	1	$103,000
MARION	1	$2,000,000
MEIGS	1	$250,000
MONROE	1	$1,700,000
MONTGOMERY	20	$23,000,000
OBION	1	$350,000
PUTNAM	1	$1,000,000
RUTHERFORD	11	$6,479,537
STEWART	1	$2,000,000
SUMNER	1	$1,500,000
TIPTON	1	$30,000
UNICOI	1	$1,100,000
WASHINGTON	2	$1,600,000
WAYNE	1	$250,000
WEAKLEY	1	not reported
Statewide Total	**85**	**$420,727,401**

Appendix 1-I
Law Enforcement — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BRADLEY	4	$23,252,000
CAMPBELL	1	$6,000,000
CANNON	2	$140,000
CARROLL	1	$90,000
CARTER	1	$1,000,000
CHEATHAM	1	$500,000
CHESTER	1	$50,000
CLAIBORNE	1	$3,000,000
CLAY	1	$70,000
COCKE	1	$300,000
COFFEE	1	not reported
CUMBERLAND	1	$70,000
DAVIDSON	17	$186,175,200
DEKALB	1	$70,000
DICKSON	1	$500,000
DYER	1	$1,600,000
FAYETTE	1	$13,000,000
FENTRESS	2	$2,570,000
FRANKLIN	3	$5,695,000
GIBSON	4	$950,000
GILES	1	not reported
GREENE	1	$135,000
HAMILTON	2	$1,598,892
HARDEMAN	1	not reported
HARDIN	1	not reported
HAWKINS	1	$200,000
HENDERSON	1	$500,000
HENRY	1	$8,000,000
HICKMAN	1	$3,500,000
HOUSTON	1	$1,200,000
HUMPHREYS	2	$2,299,999
JACKSON	2	$5,000,000
JOHNSON	1	$3,000,000
KNOX	5	$27,787,330
LAKE	2	$1,500,000
LOUDON	1	$2,300,000
MACON	2	$4,570,000
MADISON	4	$357,856
MARSHALL	1	$500,000
MAURY	2	$7,300,000
MONROE	1	$2,000,000
MONTGOMERY	4	$5,462,000
OVERTON	2	$3,070,000
PICKETT	2	$10,000,000
POLK	1	$1,250,000
PUTNAM	2	$550,000
RHEA	2	$4,400,000
ROANE	1	not reported
ROBERTSON	1	$1,000,000
SEVIER	2	$3,795,000
SHELBY	10	$17,753,075
SMITH	3	$2,670,000
SULLIVAN	3	$13,675,000
SUMNER	2	$277,000
TIPTON	2	$60,000
UNICOI	1	$100,000
VAN BUREN	1	$3,000,000
WARREN	4	$7,770,000
WASHINGTON	4	$237,400
WHITE	2	$1,570,000
WILLIAMSON	2	$180,000
Total Statewide	**131**	**$393,600,752**

Appendix 1-J
Industrial Sites and Parks — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BEDFORD	2	$12,000,000
BLEDSOE	1	$1,500,000
BRADLEY	2	$1,956,500
CAMPBELL	5	$3,200,000
CANNON	2	$400,000
CARROLL	1	$1,000,000
CARTER	3	$1,394,000
CHEATHAM	4	$7,100,000
CLAIBORNE	3	$650,000
CLAY	2	$5,500,000
COCKE	4	$4,550,000
COFFEE	4	$8,480,000
CUMBERLAND	4	$6,500,000
DECATUR	2	$3,500,000
DEKALB	2	$1,300,000
DICKSON	4	$1,250,000
DYER	2	$3,198,000
FRANKLIN	1	$85,145
GIBSON	5	$1,500,000
GILES	3	$3,300,000
GREENE	2	$616,000
GRUNDY	1	$1,180,000
HAMBLEN	3	$4,000,000
HAMILTON	4	$33,100,000
HANCOCK	3	$680,000
HARDEMAN	4	$800,000
HARDIN	1	$250,000
HAWKINS	3	$1,500,000
HAYWOOD	2	$750,000
HENRY	4	$1,550,000
HICKMAN	2	$2,500,000
HOUSTON	4	$3,350,000
HUMPHREYS	7	$8,850,000
JACKSON	4	$2,750,000
JEFFERSON	2	$1,200,000
KNOX	1	$800,000
LAKE	1	$130,000
LAUDERDALE	2	$1,200,000
LAWRENCE	2	not reported
LEWIS	2	not reported
LINCOLN	2	$1,175,000
LOUDON	4	$51,679,000
MCMINN	2	$3,000,000
MCNAIRY	2	$1,912,000
MACON	3	$2,800,000
MADISON	3	$2,255,000
MARION	2	$450,000
MARSHALL	1	$500,000
MAURY	5	$22,752,750
MEIGS	1	$400,000
MONROE	7	$6,200,000
MONTGOMERY	2	$1,350,000
MOORE	1	$10,000,000
MORGAN	1	$200,000
OBION	1	$400,000
PICKETT	6	$4,905,000
POLK	3	$2,125,000
PUTNAM	2	$2,250,000
RHEA	3	$2,600,000
ROANE	3	$7,150,000
ROBERTSON	1	$500,000
RUTHERFORD	2	$15,000,000
SCOTT	4	$14,000,000
SEQUATCHIE	1	$700,000
SEVIER	2	$3,800,000
SHELBY	1	$180,000
SMITH	2	$2,200,000
STEWART	1	$2,000,000
SULLIVAN	7	$9,235,000
SUMNER	3	$1,200,000
TIPTON	1	$1,750,000
UNICOI	6	$2,798,000
UNION	1	$1,000,000
VAN BUREN	2	$1,300,000
WARREN	4	$2,705,000
WASHINGTON	4	$7,800,000
WAYNE	2	$380,000
WEAKLEY	5	$600,000
WILSON	5	$37,500,000
Total Statewide	**218**	**$362,321,395**

Appendix 1-K
Libraries and Museums — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BRADLEY	1	$3,500,000
CANNON	1	$75,000
CHEATHAM	1	$500,000
CHESTER	1	$50,000
CLAY	3	$450,000
CUMBERLAND	3	$2,200,000
DAVIDSON	14	$187,280,000
DEKALB	1	$750,000
DICKSON	1	$500,000
FENTRESS	2	$400,000
GILES	2	$97,000
GREENE	1	$200,000
GRUNDY	1	$85,000
HAMILTON	1	$50,000
HANCOCK	1	$190,000
HARDEMAN	2	$150,000
HARDIN	1	$1,000,000
HAYWOOD	1	$1,400,000
HICKMAN	1	$750,000
HUMPHREYS	1	$400,000
JACKSON	2	$800,000
JOHNSON	1	$100,000
KNOX	8	$24,973,571
LAUDERDALE	1	$400,000
MACON	2	$450,000
MADISON	2	$1,170,000
MARION	2	$550,000
OBION	1	not reported
PICKETT	4	$1,050,000
PUTNAM	2	$650,000
ROANE	2	$600,000
RUTHERFORD	2	$6,800,000
SHELBY	5	$40,495,022
SMITH	2	$350,000
SULLIVAN	1	$190,000
TIPTON	1	$300,000
VAN BUREN	1	$200,000
WARREN	3	$21,500,000
WASHINGTON	2	$8,400,000
WHITE	1	$300,000
WILLIAMSON	1	$1,485,000
Total Statewide	86	$310,790,593

Appendix 1-L
Stormwater — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BEDFORD	3	$4,200,000
BLEDSOE	1	$1,000,000
CAMPBELL	1	$1,000,000
CARROLL	1	$100,000
CARTER	1	$1,700,000
COCKE	1	$100,000
CROCKETT	1	$1,500,000
CUMBERLAND	1	$300,000
DAVIDSON	30	$92,902,000
FRANKLIN	1	not reported
GREENE	1	$10,000,000
HAMILTON	15	$66,385,000
HARDEMAN	1	$500,000
HAYWOOD	1	$250,000
HENRY	1	$100,000
HOUSTON	1	$750,000
HUMPHREYS	1	$1,250,000
JEFFERSON	2	$1,100,000
JOHNSON	2	$50,000
KNOX	3	$29,300,000
LAKE	1	$150,000
LAWRENCE	2	not reported
LOUDON	1	$400,000
MCMINN	1	$1,500,000
MADISON	2	$2,499,000
MONTGOMERY	1	$600,000
OBION	2	$450,000
POLK	1	$500,000
PUTNAM	1	$50,000
RHEA	1	$200,000
ROBERTSON	1	$1,000,000
RUTHERFORD	3	$1,325,000
SCOTT	1	$65,000
SHELBY	24	$57,427,368
SULLIVAN	3	$388,000
UNICOI	2	$2,000,000
WASHINGTON	1	$5,500,000
WEAKLEY	1	$1,000,000
WILLIAMSON	5	$1,430,000
Statewide Total	**123**	**$288,971,368**

Appendix 1-M
Business District Development — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BLEDSOE	1	$800,000
CARROLL	1	$400,000
CHESTER	1	not reported
CLAIBORNE	1	$1,000,000
DAVIDSON	12	$178,880,000
DYER	1	not reported
FAYETTE	1	not reported
GILES	2	not reported
HAMILTON	1	$3,348,000
HAYWOOD	1	not reported
HOUSTON	1	$100,000
JACKSON	1	$400,000
KNOX	3	$10,189,000
MCNAIRY	2	$928,000
MADISON	1	$4,000,000
MARION	1	$500,000
MONROE	1	$74,869
OBION	1	not reported
RHEA	1	$500,000
ROBERTSON	1	$300,000
RUTHERFORD	1	$600,000
SEVIER	1	$250,000
SHELBY	1	$300,000
WASHINGTON	4	$54,171,000
WEAKLEY	1	$400,000
WHITE	1	$1,000,000
Statewide Total	**44**	**$258,140,869**

Appendix 1-N
Navigation — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
HAMILTON	1	$250,000,000
Statewide Total	**1**	**$250,000,000**

Appendix 1-O
Non K-12 Education — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BEDFORD	1	not reported
CHEATHAM	1	$1,500,000
HAMILTON	1	$120,000
HICKMAN	1	$1,000,000
LINCOLN	1	$4,000,000
MACON	1	$5,000,000
MARION	1	$200,000
OBION	1	$4,000,000
SCOTT	1	not reported
SHELBY	1	$662,543
WARREN	2	$101,400,000
WASHINGTON	1	$13,876,000
Statewide Total	**13**	**$131,758,543**

Appendix 1-P
Community Development — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
DAVIDSON	11	$102,202,000
HAMILTON	2	$3,550,000
HAYWOOD	1	$2,007,000
MONTGOMERY	1	$500,000
SEVIER	1	$2,930,000
SHELBY	4	$4,913,327
WASHINGTON	1	$2,625,000
Statewide Total	**21**	**$118,727,327**

Appendix 1-Q
Housing — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BENTON	1	not reported
CAMPBELL	2	$2,600,000
CANNON	4	$2,500,000
CARROLL	1	not reported
CARTER	1	$500,000
CHEATHAM	1	$1,000,000
CHESTER	1	$100,000
CLAY	3	$775,000
CROCKETT	2	$807,000
CUMBERLAND	3	$2,150,000
DAVIDSON	3	$5,468,000
DECATUR	2	$1,000,000
DEKALB	3	$1,830,000
DYER	2	$50,000
FRANKLIN	2	$70,000
GIBSON	6	$2,909,000
GILES	1	$200,500
GREENE	4	$2,085,000
HAMILTON	1	$315,000
HANCOCK	3	$1,500,000
HARDEMAN	2	$20,000,000
HARDIN	1	not reported
HAWKINS	5	$2,215,000
HAYWOOD	2	$7,000,000
HENDERSON	2	$500,000
HENRY	4	$6,000,000
HUMPHREYS	4	$5,330,000
JACKSON	9	$7,660,000
JOHNSON	1	$500,000
LAKE	3	$980,000
LAWRENCE	2	$550,000
LINCOLN	2	$500,000
MCMINN	1	$72,000
MCNAIRY	4	$901,900
MACON	3	$5,137,500
OBION	7	$1,811,000
OVERTON	1	$1,375,000
PERRY	2	$1,000,000
PICKETT	2	$3,820,000
PUTNAM	4	$5,500,000
SCOTT	2	$500,000
SHELBY	1	$500,000
SMITH	2	$1,000,000
SULLIVAN	2	$1,000,000
SUMNER	1	$2,500,000
TROUSDALE	1	$1,120,000
UNICOI	4	$3,500,000
VAN BUREN	3	$1,220,000
WASHINGTON	3	$4,500,000
WAYNE	4	$1,850,000
WEAKLEY	3	$250,000
WHITE	1	$500,000
WILSON	1	$500,000
Total Statewide	**135**	**$115,651,900**

Appendix 1-R
Telecommunications — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BEDFORD	1	not reported
BRADLEY	1	$540,000
CAMPBELL	1	not reported
CANNON	3	$500,000
CARTER	1	$500,000
CLAY	2	$400,000
COCKE	1	not reported
CUMBERLAND	4	$1,300,000
DAVIDSON	18	$50,824,000
DEKALB	5	$1,200,000
DYER	1	$2,000,000
FENTRESS	3	$750,000
GIBSON	1	$60,000
HAMILTON	2	$2,960,000
HANCOCK	1	$310,000
HAYWOOD	1	$485,000
JACKSON	2	$700,000
KNOX	5	$1,633,000
MACON	2	$900,000
MADISON	3	$6,075,000
MARSHALL	1	$1,200,000
MONTGOMERY	1	$1,500,000
OVERTON	2	$150,000
PICKETT	2	$700,000
PUTNAM	5	$1,500,000
SHELBY	4	$9,260,930
SMITH	4	$800,000
SULLIVAN	7	$13,050,000
SUMNER	3	$490,000
VAN BUREN	2	$400,000
WARREN	5	$1,400,000
WASHINGTON	2	$210,000
WHITE	3	$850,000
WILLIAMSON	2	$1,525,000
Statewide Total	**101**	**$104,172,930**

Appendix 1-S
Fire Protection — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BEDFORD	1	$1,400,000
BRADLEY	2	$750,000
CAMPBELL	2	$800,000
CARROLL	3	$631,950
CARTER	1	$23,000
CHEATHAM	5	$4,520,000
CHESTER	2	$615,000
CLAIBORNE	1	$150,000
COCKE	2	$300,000
CROCKETT	1	$50,000
CUMBERLAND	3	$700,000
DAVIDSON	21	$30,475,000
DECATUR	1	not reported
DEKALB	1	$180,000
DICKSON	1	$200,000
DYER	2	$900,000
FAYETTE	4	$595,000
FRANKLIN	2	$280,000
GIBSON	4	$1,350,000
GILES	1	$60,000
GREENE	4	$1,410,000
GRUNDY	1	$300,000
HAMILTON	3	$861,000
HANCOCK	1	$160,000
HARDEMAN	1	$150,000
HAWKINS	5	$517,000
HAYWOOD	1	$1,000,000
HICKMAN	1	$50,000
HOUSTON	2	$400,000
JACKSON	1	$150,000
JOHNSON	1	$300,000
KNOX	2	$925,000
LAKE	1	not reported
LAWRENCE	1	$100,000
LINCOLN	2	$500,000
LOUDON	1	$300,000
MCMINN	1	$1,500,000
MCNAIRY	4	$1,195,000
MACON	2	$600,000
MADISON	7	$1,995,200
MARION	2	$650,000
MARSHALL	5	$1,060,000
MAURY	1	$275,000
MONROE	2	$830,000
MONTGOMERY	10	$2,753,000
OBION	3	$575,000
OVERTON	2	$500,000
PUTNAM	7	$1,425,000
ROBERTSON	3	$650,000
RUTHERFORD	7	$3,400,000
SCOTT	2	$137,000
SEVIER	1	$2,850,000
SHELBY	11	$6,746,000
STEWART	1	$250,000
SULLIVAN	5	$3,139,000
SUMNER	6	$2,495,000
TIPTON	1	$200,000
UNICOI	1	$50,000
WARREN	9	$2,725,471
WASHINGTON	10	$5,126,500
WEAKLEY	1	$1,000,000
WILLIAMSON	6	$3,500,000
WILSON	3	$1,700,000
Total Statewide	**201**	**$98,430,121**

Appendix 1-T
Solid Waste — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BEDFORD	1	$200,000
BLEDSOE	2	$275,000
CAMPBELL	3	$1,000,000
CANNON	3	$600,000
CARTER	1	$100,000
CHEATHAM	1	$50,000
CLAIBORNE	2	$1,000,000
CLAY	2	$115,000
COFFEE	1	$650,000
CUMBERLAND	4	$355,000
DAVIDSON	7	$21,700,000
DEKALB	5	$425,000
DYER	1	$1,500,000
FAYETTE	1	$170,000
FENTRESS	3	$205,000
FRANKLIN	2	$55,000
GIBSON	2	$600,000
GILES	2	$1,480,766
GREENE	2	$4,200,000
GRUNDY	2	$1,050,000
HAMILTON	12	$20,583,000
HAWKINS	1	$80,000
HAYWOOD	1	not reported
HENRY	1	$265,000
HUMPHREYS	1	$300,000
JACKSON	2	$250,000
LAKE	1	$80,000
LAUDERDALE	1	$120,000
LAWRENCE	1	$300,000
MCMINN	2	$600,000
MCNAIRY	1	not reported
MACON	4	$335,000
MADISON	2	$1,437,500
MARSHALL	1	$300,000
MAURY	3	$1,406,000
MEIGS	1	$200,000
MONROE	1	$150,000
MOORE	2	$84,000
OVERTON	1	$85,000
PERRY	2	$675,000
PICKETT	1	$90,000
PUTNAM	7	$645,000
RHEA	2	$5,350,000
ROBERTSON	1	$200,000
SCOTT	2	Not Reported
SHELBY	4	$1,930,000
SMITH	3	$270,000
SULLIVAN	4	$1,489,500
SUMNER	4	$7,000,000
VAN BUREN	2	$270,000
WARREN	7	$1,660,000
WASHINGTON	4	$2,150,000
WEAKLEY	1	$500,000
WHITE	4	$1,180,000
WILLIAMSON	1	$410,000
Statewide Total	**135**	**$86,125,766**

Appendix 1-U
Other Facilities — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BRADLEY	1	$7,000,000
CHEATHAM	1	$100,000
CLAIBORNE	1	$100,000
COFFEE	2	$600,000
DAVIDSON	14	$35,839,000
DECATUR	1	$1,500,000
GREENE	1	$200,000
HAMBLEN	1	$700,000
HAMILTON	1	$270,000
HANCOCK	1	$80,000
HARDIN	1	$47,000
HAWKINS	1	$200,000
HENRY	1	$150,000
HICKMAN	2	$325,000
KNOX	1	$500,000
LINCOLN	2	$75,000
MCMINN	2	$1,600,000
MADISON	4	$1,493,462
MONTGOMERY	1	$50,000
PUTNAM	1	$75,000
RHEA	2	$3,300,000
SCOTT	3	not reported
SHELBY	7	$4,229,934
SULLIVAN	3	$461,000
UNICOI	1	$150,000
WASHINGTON	3	$1,153,000
WILLIAMSON	2	$1,550,000
Statewide Total	**61**	**$61,748,396**

Appendix 1-V
Property Acquisition — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
CAMPBELL	1	$300,000
DAVIDSON	4	$57,775,000
DYER	1	$250,000
KNOX	1	$2,400,000
SEQUATCHIE	1	$300,000
Statewide Total	**8**	**$61,025,000**

Appendix 1-W
Public Health — Number of Projects and Cost by County

County	Number of Projects	Cost of Projects
BLEDSOE	1	$1,000,000
CANNON	2	$300,000
CHEATHAM	2	$800,000
CLAY	1	$150,000
CUMBERLAND	4	$600,000
DAVIDSON	13	$22,490,000
DEKALB	5	$750,000
FENTRESS	3	$450,000
GREENE	1	$600,000
HAMILTON	1	$1,000,000
HARDEMAN	2	$1,000,000
HARDIN	1	not reported
HENRY	2	$5,000,000
HICKMAN	2	$750,000
JACKSON	1	$150,000
JOHNSON	1	$600,000
LAKE	2	$565,000
LEWIS	1	$300,000
MADISON	2	$625,000
OVERTON	2	$300,000
PICKETT	2	$300,000
POLK	1	$300,000
PUTNAM	4	$600,000
ROBERTSON	1	$200,000
SHELBY	8	$7,299,750
SMITH	3	$450,000
STEWART	1	$350,000
SUMNER	3	$3,100,000
TROUSDALE	1	$50,000
UNION	1	$150,000
VAN BUREN	3	$550,000
WARREN	4	$600,000
WHITE	3	$450,000
WILSON	1	$1,000,000
Statewide Total	**85**	**$52,829,750**

Appendix 2-A

State of Tennessee
Infrastructure Needs Inventory Project
FY1998 Education Survey Form

This form is divided into three sections: (A) General Information; (B) Current Campus Needs; and (C) Future Campus Needs. This survey is designed to capture needs and expenditures over a five year period. If additional space is needed, attach extra sheet(s) as necessary. Please specify question responses.

Please Note: There is **no minimum** expenditure requirement for inclusion of a project in this survey report.

A. General Information

A1 **Project Number:** _____--_____

A two part 7-digit number that is unique to each school. It is the same numbering system used by the TN Dept. of Education to identify each Local Education Agency (L.E.A.) and school facility. It will be used for entry into the statewide database. If you do not know this ID number, your development district can provide it.

A2 **Date:** _____

The date that this form is completed.

A3 **Development District:** _____

The development district that serves this school.

A4 **County:** _____

The county in which this school campus is located.

A5 **L.E.A:** _____

The legal name of the school system that operates this school campus.

A6 **School:** _____

The legal name of this school.

A7 **Grade Levels Served** (circle all that apply): PK -- K -- 1 -- 2 -- 3 -- 4 -- 5 -- 6 -- 7 -- 8 -- 9 -- 10 -- 11 -- 12

Vocational -- Special -- Alternative -- Adult -- Other (specify): _____

Circle the grade levels/ programs that this school serves. If a program is not listed, please cite it in the blank provided.

B. Current Campus Conditions

B1 **Construction date of main campus building** _____ ***B2*** **Year of most recent major renovation** _____

Indicate the year of construction and most recent major renovation for the main building on campus in the specified blanks. Major renovations are defined as those that require an investment greater than 25% of the estimated replacement cost at the time, and significantly extend the building's useful life.

B3 **If this school was constructed or had any major renovations or additions in the last five years, please describe and provide the square footage and the total cost for each project:**

Project(s)	Square Footage of Project	Total Cost
Example: 4 classrooms & teacher work area constructed	*7,900*	*$495,000*

Provide the square footage for each construction or renovation project at this school in the last five years, and total cost for the project(s).

B4 **Are any of this school's facilities shared with another educational institution?** Please cite the name of the institution and list the shared facilities: _____

_____

Does this school share any buildings or facilities with another school? For example, a high school may share a classroom(s), auditorium, lunchroom, gymnasium, playground or other area(s) with an elementary school on the same campus or a neighboring one. If yes, please cite the name of that school and list the buildings or other facilities that are shared.

B5 **Does this school conduct programs/classes off-campus due to a lack of adequate facilities?** Please describe related circumstances/needs: _____

_____

This form has been slightly modified.

Component Facilities Condition

B6 **Please indicate the number of component facilities in terms of condition, using the facility rating scale provided below. If this campus has component facilities that are not listed below, report and evaluate them in the "Other" rows provided.** Also, cite the total number of components on this campus. An example is provided in the first row of the table.

Please consider the condition of the following systems in this evaluation: *framing; floors; foundation; exterior walls; windows; roofing; plumbing; electrical wiring/ power supply; HVAC; interior lighting; interior finishes; and corridors.*

COMPONENT FACILITIES	EXCELLENT	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	REPLACE	TOTAL NUMBER OF COMPONENTS
Example: Classrooms (Permanent)	*4*	*5*			*5*	*14*
Classrooms (Permanent)						
Classrooms (Portable)						
Science Labs						
Auditorium						
Cafeteria						
Library/Media Center						
Restrooms						
Vocational/Industrial Arts Labs and Shops						
Administrative & Support Offices/Workspace						
Health/First Aid Room						
Indoor Physical Ed. Facilities/ Gymnasium						
Outdoor Playground Area						
Auxiliary Support Buildings						
(Other)						
(Other)						

FACILITY RATING SCALE:

Excellent: new or easily restorable to "like new" condition; minimal routine maintenance required.
Good: some routine and preventive maintenance or minor repair required.
Fair: fails to meet building code or functional requirements in some cases (facility problems are inconvenient); extensive corrective maintenance and repair required.
Poor: consistent substandard performance (facility problems are disruptive and very costly); fails most building code or functional requirements, requires constant attention, renovation, or replacement; major corrective repair or overhaul required.
Replace: significantly substandard performance; replacement required.

Rate the Condition of the School Facility

B7 **Please mark the overall condition of this school's facilities based on the rating scale above.**

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Replace

Please mark the appropriate box to indicate the overall condition of the entire campus' facilities. Use the facility rating scale provided to determine the classification of this school.

B8 **Is there a plan to close or not operate this facility as a school during the next five years?** If so, please explain:

_____

_____

This form has been slightly modified.

B9 **Explain condition ratings of "Fair," "Poor," or "Replace" from Question B6.**

List each component/need separately, with its current condition, stage of project, and best cost estimate to upgrade the component to at least "Good" condition, over the next five years. Choose a stage of development for each project from the following box. If this section does not apply, indicate this with "**N/A**" under "**Component**" in the first row.

Stages of Project Development	
Conceptual:	This project is an idea or concept.
Planning & Design:	This project is on paper and has received significant analysis.
Construction:	This project has moved earth, poured concrete, or erected part of the structure.

Do not include costs for additional facilities to meet EIA requirements cited in Section C2.

Component (from Section B6)	**Condition** (from Section B6)	**Stage of Project** (from box above)	**Cost to Upgrade** (Cost of Project)
Example: 5 Classrooms	*Replace*	*Planning & Design*	*$250,000*

B10 **Source(s) of cost data for upgrade** (check all that apply):

_____ Inspection by licensed professionals within last 3 years
_____ Capital improvements plan
_____ Work currently under contract
_____ Professional judgment
Other (please specify): _____

Federal/ State Mandates

B11 **How much will it cost this school to comply with the following or any other mandates during the next five years? If it applies, please explain the need and estimate any expenditure.** If a mandate is not listed, please cite the level of government (Federal or State) and its specific program name. Please explain any need driven by a mandate and estimate the expenditure in the appropriate block. If a mandate does not apply, indicate this with "**N/A**" in the description blank.

Do not include costs to meet EIA requirements cited in Section C2.

Level of Government	Mandate	Please describe need(s):	Expenditure
Federal	Americans with Disabilities Act		$
Federal	Asbestos		$
Federal	Lead		$
Federal	Radon		$
Federal	Underground Storage Tanks		$
			$
			$
			$
			$
			$

Please describe the need and the estimated expenditure to comply with the mandates listed above. If a specific mandate is not listed, provide its origin, name, a brief description, and a cost estimate in the additional rows provided.

This form has been slightly modified.

Technology

B12 **Can the students at this school regularly use these technology resources?** (Yes/ No)

_____ Internet
_____ Local Area Network (LAN)
_____ Fiber Optic Cable
_____ Integrated Services Digital Network (ISDN)
_____ Distance Learning/Instruction

B13 **Please describe current technology needs and estimated costs:**
If this section does not apply, indicate this with **"N/A"** in the first row.

Example: Equipment for networking 30 computers in 10 classrooms $ *6,000*

_____ $_____

_____ $_____

_____ $_____

_____ $_____

_____ $_____

_____ $_____

Please describe current technology needs and estimated costs. In regard to the available resources, what are the current technology needs of this school? Briefly describe and provide a cost estimate for each specific need.

C. Future Campus Needs

Total Facility Area

C1 **Please indicate the current total square footage for this school and the estimated additional square footage required by the 2002-03 school year.**

Current Square Footage (1997-98 School Yr.)

	Permanent Facilities	Portable Facilities
Classroom	sq. ft.	sq. ft.
Non-classroom	sq. ft.	sq. ft.

Additional Square Footage needed by the 2002-03 School Yr.

	Permanent Facilities	Portable Facilities
Classroom	sq. ft.	sq. ft.
Non-classroom	sq. ft.	sq. ft.

Cite this school's current gross square footage and the additional gross square footage that will be required for the 2002-2003 school year for classroom and non-classroom space, by permanent and portable facilities, in the appropriate block.

Education Improvement Act of 1992 (EIA)

C2 **If the class size requirement in the EIA were in full effect in the 1998-99 school year, would this school be in compliance?** (Y/N) _____
If no, please explain: _____

Will this school satisfy the EIA (or Basic Education Program (BEP)) requirements for facilities (such as classrooms and teacher-student ratios) for the 1998-99 school year? If no, please specify the area(s) of non-compliance.

C3 **How many *additional* classrooms will this school need to comply with the EIA during the next five years?** _____
In reference to the EIA teacher-student ratio requirements, how many **additional** classrooms will this school need to comply?

This form has been slightly modified.

C4 **Please estimate the total cost for each classroom and facility *addition* needed to comply with the EIA over the next five years.**

List each component/ need separately, with a project stage, and best cost estimate for each component that your school must construct to comply with the EIA. Please be as specific as possible. For example, if you are building a classroom wing addition with 10 classrooms and 2 restrooms, please enter them as separate components, as shown in the examples below. Choose from the stages of development previously listed in Section B9 for each project. If this section does not apply, indicate this with **"N/A"** under **"Component"** in the first row.

Do not include any portion of the estimated costs for upgrading existing facilities cited in Sections B9, B11, or B13 .

Component	Stage of Project	Cost of Project
Example: 10 Classrooms	*Planning & Design*	*$800,000*
Example: 2 Restrooms	*Planning & Design*	*$200,000*

D Survey Reporting

D1 **Surveyor/Title:** _____
Signature and title of the person completing this survey form.

D2 **Agency:** _____
Employer of the person completing this survey form.

D3 **Superintendent:** _____
Signature of the school system superintendent for this school.

D4 **School Board Chair:** _____
Signature of the school board chair for this school.

D5 **School/ School District Contact Person for Follow-up:** _____

D6 **Contact's Title** _____ ***D7*** **Telephone Number:** _____/_____--_____
Who can the TACIR or development district contact for follow-up related to information on this form? Please give this person's name, title, and telephone area code and number.

This form has been slightly modified.

Appendix 2-B
Tennessee School System List by County
Fiscal Year 1998

County Name	School System (LEA)
ANDERSON	ANDERSON COUNTY
ANDERSON	CLINTON CITY
ANDERSON	OAK RIDGE
BEDFORD	BEDFORD COUNTY
BENTON	BENTON COUNTY
BLEDSOE	BLEDSOE COUNTY
BLOUNT	ALCOA CITY
BLOUNT	BLOUNT COUNTY
BLOUNT	MARYVILLE CITY
BRADLEY	BRADLEY COUNTY
BRADLEY	CLEVELAND CITY
CAMPBELL	CAMPBELL COUNTY
CANNON	CANNON COUNTY
CARROLL	CARROLL COUNTY
CARROLL	HOLLOW ROCK-BRUCETON
CARROLL	HUNTINGDON SSD
CARROLL	MCKENZIE SSD
CARROLL	SOUTH CARROLL SSD
CARROLL	WEST CARROLL SSD
CARTER	CARTER COUNTY
CARTER	ELIZABETHTON CITY
CHEATHAM	CHEATHAM COUNTY
CHESTER	CHESTER COUNTY
CLAIBORNE	CLAIBORNE COUNTY
CLAY	CLAY COUNTY
COCKE	COCKE COUNTY
COCKE	NEWPORT CITY
COFFEE	COFFEE COUNTY
COFFEE	MANCHESTER CITY
COFFEE	TULLAHOMA CITY
CROCKETT	ALAMO CITY
CROCKETT	BELLS CITY
CROCKETT	CROCKETT COUNTY
CUMBERLAND	CUMBERLAND COUNTY
DAVIDSON	DAVIDSON COUNTY
DECATUR	DECATUR COUNTY
DEKALB	DEKALB COUNTY
DICKSON	DICKSON COUNTY
DYER	DYER COUNTY
DYER	DYERSBURG CITY
FAYETTE	FAYETTE COUNTY
FENTRESS	FENTRESS COUNTY
FRANKLIN	FRANKLIN COUNTY
GIBSON	BRADFORD SSD

County Name	School System (LEA)
GIBSON	GIBSON SSD
GIBSON	HUMBOLDT CITY
GIBSON	MILAN SSD
GIBSON	TRENTON SSD
GILES	GILES COUNTY
GRAINGER	GRAINGER COUNTY
GREENE	GREENE COUNTY
GREENE	GREENEVILLE CITY
GRUNDY	GRUNDY COUNTY
HAMBLEN	HAMBLEN COUNTY
HAMILTON	HAMILTON COUNTY
HANCOCK	HANCOCK COUNTY
HARDEMAN	HARDEMAN COUNTY
HARDIN	HARDIN COUNTY
HAWKINS	HAWKINS COUNTY
HAWKINS	ROGERSVILLE CITY
HAYWOOD	HAYWOOD COUNTY
HENDERSON	HENDERSON COUNTY
HENDERSON	LEXINGTON CITY
HENRY	HENRY COUNTY
HENRY	PARIS SSD
HICKMAN	HICKMAN COUNTY
HOUSTON	HOUSTON COUNTY
HUMPHREYS	HUMPHREYS COUNTY
JACKSON	JACKSON COUNTY
JEFFERSON	JEFFERSON COUNTY
JOHNSON	JOHNSON COUNTY
KNOX	KNOX COUNTY
LAKE	LAKE COUNTY
LAUDERDALE	LAUDERDALE COUNTY
LAWRENCE	LAWRENCE COUNTY
LEWIS	LEWIS COUNTY
LINCOLN	FAYETTEVILLE CITY
LINCOLN	LINCOLN COUNTY
LOUDON	LENOIR CITY
LOUDON	LOUDON COUNTY
MCMINN	ATHENS CITY
MCMINN	ETOWAH CITY
MCMINN	MCMINN COUNTY
MCNAIRY	MCNAIRY COUNTY
MACON	MACON COUNTY
MADISON	JACKSON-MADISON CO.
MARION	MARION COUNTY
MARION	RICHARD CITY SSD

Appendix 2-B (cont.)
Tennessee School System List by County
Fiscal Year 1998

County Name	School System (LEA)
MARSHALL	MARSHALL COUNTY
MAURY	MAURY COUNTY
MEIGS	MEIGS COUNTY
MONROE	MONROE COUNTY
MONROE	SWEETWATER CITY
MONTGOMERY	MONTGOMERY COUNTY
MOORE	MOORE COUNTY
MORGAN	MORGAN COUNTY
OBION	OBION COUNTY
OBION	UNION CITY
OVERTON	OVERTON COUNTY
PERRY	PERRY COUNTY
PICKETT	PICKETT COUNTY
POLK	POLK COUNTY
PUTNAM	PUTNAM COUNTY
RHEA	DAYTON CITY
RHEA	RHEA COUNTY
ROANE	HARRIMAN CITY
ROANE	ROANE COUNTY
ROBERTSON	ROBERTSON COUNTY
RUTHERFORD	MURFREESBORO CITY
RUTHERFORD	RUTHERFORD COUNTY
SCOTT	ONEIDA SSD
SCOTT	SCOTT COUNTY
SEQUATCHIE	SEQUATCHIE COUNTY
SEVIER	SEVIER COUNTY
SHELBY	MEMPHIS CITY
SHELBY	SHELBY COUNTY
SMITH	SMITH COUNTY
STEWART	STEWART COUNTY
SULLIVAN	BRISTOL CITY
SULLIVAN	KINGSPORT CITY
SULLIVAN	SULLIVAN COUNTY
SUMNER	SUMNER COUNTY
TIPTON	COVINGTON CITY
TIPTON	TIPTON COUNTY
TROUSDALE	TROUSDALE COUNTY
UNICOI	UNICOI COUNTY
UNION	UNION COUNTY
VAN BUREN	VAN BUREN COUNTY
WARREN	WARREN COUNTY
WASHINGTON	JOHNSON CITY
WASHINGTON	WASHINGTON COUNTY

County Name	School System (LEA)
WAYNE	WAYNE COUNTY
WEAKLEY	WEAKLEY COUNTY
WHITE	WHITE COUNTY
WILLIAMSON	FRANKLIN SSD
WILLIAMSON	WILLIAMSON COUNTY
WILSON	LEBANON CITY
WILSON	WILSON COUNTY

Appendix 2-C
Total Cost of All Reported K-12 Public Education Infrastructure Needs by LEA

Appendix 2-C shows the grand total of all education infrastructure needs costs reported by the LEA. Cost data for this Appendix were taken from the Education Survey form and the General Survey form of each LEA. The cost are the sum of the following reported by each LEA:

-total costs of repairs and renovations needed to bring each school in the system up to at least a "good" condition;
-total costs to comply with Federal and State mandates;
-total costs of current technology needs;
-total costs to comply with the Education Improvement Act; and
-total cost needed for new school construction and infrastructure needs not associated with existing schools.

School System (LEA)	Total Cost of All K-12 Education Infrastructure Needs
ALAMO CITY	$436,000
ALCOA CITY	$1,819,800
ANDERSON COUNTY	$10,300,760
ATHENS CITY	$185,000
BEDFORD COUNTY	$52,383,150
BELLS CITY	$0
BENTON COUNTY	$20,793,305
BLEDSOE COUNTY	$6,395,800
BLOUNT COUNTY	$8,097,000
BRADFORD SSD	$222,000
BRADLEY COUNTY	$44,587,730
BRISTOL CITY	$3,111,000
CAMPBELL COUNTY	$11,373,750
CANNON COUNTY	$8,139,975
CARROLL COUNTY	$974,300
CARTER COUNTY	$8,800,000
CHEATHAM COUNTY	$1,455,500
CHESTER COUNTY	$570,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY	$1,870,005
CLAY COUNTY	$2,020,500
CLEVELAND CITY	$54,302,600
CLINTON CITY	$1,565,796
COCKE COUNTY	$19,299,801
COFFEE COUNTY	$3,698,800
COVINGTON CITY	$158,000
CROCKETT COUNTY	$425,000
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	$20,867,956
DAVIDSON COUNTY	$187,867,300
DAYTON CITY	$470,000
DECATUR COUNTY	$12,346,200
DEKALB COUNTY	$4,323,143
DICKSON COUNTY	$40,414,300

School System (LEA)	Total Cost of All K-12 Education Infrastructure Needs
DYER COUNTY	$90,158,000
DYERSBURG CITY	$517,000
ELIZABETHTON CITY	$1,988,200
ETOWAH CITY	$120,000
FAYETTE COUNTY	$15,559,700
FAYETTEVILLE CITY	$1,900,000
FENTRESS COUNTY	$3,062,000
FRANKLIN COUNTY	$44,272,650
FRANKLIN SSD	$4,905,954
GIBSON SSD	$1,138,000
GILES COUNTY	$5,768,000
GRAINGER COUNTY	$7,903,700
GREENE COUNTY	$36,001,200
GREENEVILLE CITY	$3,506,300
GRUNDY COUNTY	$1,525,640
HAMBLEN COUNTY	$6,340,464
HAMILTON COUNTY	$112,948,026
HANCOCK COUNTY	$432,500
HARDEMAN COUNTY	$4,183,900
HARDIN COUNTY	$31,511,185
HARRIMAN CITY	$1,799,300
HAWKINS COUNTY	$5,800,450
HAYWOOD COUNTY	$330,895
HENDERSON COUNTY	$14,397,000
HENRY COUNTY	$18,553,442
HICKMAN COUNTY	$10,069,000
HOLLOW ROCK-BRUCETON	$6,515,000
HOUSTON COUNTY	$8,999,000
HUMBOLDT CITY	$18,868,000
HUMPHREYS COUNTY	$2,064,500
HUNTINGDON SSD	$17,062,000
JACKSON COUNTY	$4,475,800

Appendix 2-C (cont.)

School System (LEA)	Total Cost of All K-12 Education Infrastructure Needs
JACKSON-MADISON COUNTY	$18,373,995
JEFFERSON COUNTY	$13,000,177
JOHNSON CITY	$6,024,000
JOHNSON COUNTY	$25,160,927
KINGSPORT CITY	$24,585,745
KNOX COUNTY	$205,051,417
LAKE COUNTY	$706,000
LAUDERDALE COUNTY	$587,000
LAWRENCE COUNTY	$9,584,569
LEBANON CITY	$1,538,000
LENOIR CITY	$6,658,250
LEWIS COUNTY	$4,915,000
LEXINGTON CITY	$3,025,000
LINCOLN COUNTY	$11,200,600
LOUDON COUNTY	$5,877,820
MACON COUNTY	$4,447,000
MANCHESTER CITY	$2,504,000
MARION COUNTY	$15,778,830
MARSHALL COUNTY	$27,727,131
MARYVILLE CITY	$10,419,000
MAURY COUNTY	$26,814,009
MCKENZIE SSD	$1,184,784
MCMINN COUNTY	$929,100
MCNAIRY COUNTY	$4,921,000
MEIGS COUNTY	$2,344,000
MEMPHIS CITY	$548,265,474
MILAN SSD	$12,028,200
MONROE COUNTY	$7,404,464
MONTGOMERY COUNTY	$5,262,100
MOORE COUNTY	$1,750,000
MORGAN COUNTY	$5,760,881
MURFREESBORO CITY	$345,315
NEWPORT CITY	$2,355,000
OAK RIDGE	$11,222,000
OBION COUNTY	$2,316,000
ONEIDA SSD	$0
OVERTON COUNTY	$11,320,700
PARIS SSD	$0
PERRY COUNTY	$23,350,000
PICKETT COUNTY	$2,140,000
POLK COUNTY	$18,106,000
PUTNAM COUNTY	$39,729,400
RHEA COUNTY	$7,005,000
RICHARD CITY SSD	$1,773,000
ROANE COUNTY	$6,803,000
ROBERTSON COUNTY	$4,300,000
ROGERSVILLE CITY	$7,630,000
RUTHERFORD COUNTY	$11,285,124
SCOTT COUNTY	$2,092,000
SEQUATCHIE COUNTY	$5,796,500
SEVIER COUNTY	$44,085,346
SHELBY COUNTY	$55,440,540
SMITH COUNTY	$18,830,100
SOUTH CARROLL SSD	$515,389
STEWART COUNTY	$24,160,000
SULLIVAN COUNTY	$15,641,064
SUMNER COUNTY	$22,724,323
SWEETWATER CITY	$1,363,500
TIPTON COUNTY	$14,369,794
TRENTON SSD	$1,669,000
TROUSDALE COUNTY	$1,025,000
TULLAHOMA CITY	$19,303,000
UNICOI COUNTY	$13,593,057
UNION CITY	$631,000
UNION COUNTY	$388,000
VAN BUREN COUNTY	$5,046,200
WARREN COUNTY	$5,058,820
WASHINGTON COUNTY	$12,192,000
WAYNE COUNTY	$20,807,900
WEAKLEY COUNTY	$6,895,000
WEST CARROLL SSD	$2,764,000
WHITE COUNTY	$2,510,000
WILLIAMSON COUNTY	$3,442,750
WILSON COUNTY	$20,251,834
STATE-WIDE TOTAL	**$2,520,422,533**

Appendix 2-D
Reported Total Cost of System-Wide Needs and New School Construction by LEA

Appendix 2-D shows costs reported by 64 LEAs for system-wide needs and new school construction. Data in Appendix 2-D were collected from the General Survey Form distributed to each LEA to determine new construction cost estimates and needs not related to existing school facilities.

LEA	Total Cost of System Wide Needs and New School Construction
BEDFORD COUNTY	$39,000,000
BENTON COUNTY	$10,400,000
BLEDSOE COUNTY	$4,200,000
BRADLEY COUNTY	$20,000,000
CANNON COUNTY	$2,000,000
CARTER COUNTY	$6,000,000
CHESTER COUNTY	$485,000
CLAY COUNTY	$763,000
CLEVELAND CITY	$42,000,000
COCKE COUNTY	$24,366,127
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	$14,320,000
DAVIDSON COUNTY	$59,880,000
DECATUR COUNTY	$12,000,000
DEKALB COUNTY	$2,500,000
DICKSON COUNTY	$26,000,000
DYER COUNTY	$30,000,000
DYERSBURG CITY	$150,000
FAYETTE COUNTY	$15,000,000
FRANKLIN COUNTY	$35,000,000
HAMILTON COUNTY	$12,500,000
HARDEMAN COUNTY	$1,250,000
HENRY COUNTY	$500,000
HICKMAN COUNTY	$7,000,000
HOLLOW ROCK-BRUCETON	$6,200,000
HOUSTON COUNTY	$8,000,000
HUMBOLDT CITY	$8,000,000
HUNTINGDON SSD	$7,300,000
JACKSON COUNTY	$1,500,000
JACKSON-MADISON COUNTY	$7,500,000
JOHNSON COUNTY	$9,895,553
KINGSPORT CITY	$8,500,000
LAWRENCE COUNTY	$2,100,000
LEWIS COUNTY	$2,000,000
LINCOLN COUNTY	$350,000
MACON COUNTY	$1,750,000
MANCHESTER CITY	$1,362,000
MARION COUNTY	$8,476,250
MARSHALL COUNTY	$8,000,000
MAURY COUNTY	$12,000,000
MEIGS COUNTY	$85,000

LEA	Total Cost of System Wide Needs and New School Construction
MEMPHIS CITY	$147,238,000
MILAN SSD	$180,000
OVERTON COUNTY	$3,000,000
PERRY COUNTY	$6,500,000
POLK COUNTY	$10,700,000
PUTNAM COUNTY	$27,075,000
RHEA COUNTY	$4,000,000
SCOTT COUNTY	not reported
SEQUATCHIE COUNTY	$1,000,000
SEVIER COUNTY	$30,000,000
SHELBY COUNTY	$250,000
SMITH COUNTY	$15,000,000
STEWART COUNTY	$17,000,000
SUMNER COUNTY	$8,000,000
TIPTON COUNTY	$10,250,000
TRENTON SSD	$780,000
TULLAHOMA CITY	$4,500,000
UNICOI COUNTY	$11,050,507
VAN BUREN COUNTY	$5,000,000
WARREN COUNTY	$2,000,000
WAYNE COUNTY	$15,000,000
WEAKLEY COUNTY	$250,000
WHITE COUNTY	$2,000,000
WILSON COUNTY	$5,500,000
STATE-WIDE TOTALS	**$784,606,437**

Appendix 2-E
Reported Total Cost of Infrastructure Needs for Existing Schools by LEA

Appendix 2-E shows the reported costs to each LEA for infrastructure improvements to existing schools in the LEA. These include:

-costs of repairs and renovations to bring all schools up to a "good" condition;
-costs of mandate related infrastructures needs;
-costs of current technology needs.
-costs of complying with the Education Improvement Act; and

Costs associated with the construction of new schools ARE NOT included in these totals.

LEA	Total Cost of Infrastructure Needs for Existing Schools
ALAMO CITY	$436,000
ALCOA CITY	$1,819,800
ANDERSON COUNTY	$10,300,760
ATHENS CITY	$185,000
BEDFORD COUNTY	$13,383,150
BELLS CITY	$0
BENTON COUNTY	$10,393,305
BLEDSOE COUNTY	$2,195,800
BLOUNT COUNTY	$8,097,000
BRADFORD SSD	$222,000
BRADLEY COUNTY	$24,587,730
BRISTOL CITY	$3,111,000
CAMPBELL COUNTY	$11,373,750
CANNON COUNTY	$6,139,975
CARROLL COUNTY	$974,300
CARTER COUNTY	$2,800,000
CHEATHAM COUNTY	$1,455,500
CHESTER COUNTY	$85,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY	$1,870,005
CLAY COUNTY	$1,257,500
CLEVELAND CITY	$12,302,600
CLINTON CITY	$1,565,796
COCKE COUNTY	$19,299,801
COFFEE COUNTY	$3,698,800
COVINGTON CITY	$158,000
CROCKETT COUNTY	$425,000
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	$6,547,956
DAVIDSON COUNTY	$127,987,300
DAYTON CITY	$470,000
DECATUR COUNTY	$346,200
DEKALB COUNTY	$1,823,143
DICKSON COUNTY	$14,414,300
DYER COUNTY	$60,158,000

LEA	Total Cost of Infrastructure Needs for Existing Schools
DYERSBURG CITY	$367,000
ELIZABETHTON CITY	$1,988,200
ETOWAH CITY	$120,000
FAYETTE COUNTY	$559,700
FAYETTEVILLE CITY	$1,900,000
FENTRESS COUNTY	$3,062,000
FRANKLIN COUNTY	$9,272,650
FRANKLIN SSD	$4,905,954
GIBSON SSD	$1,138,000
GILES COUNTY	$5,768,000
GRAINGER COUNTY	$7,903,700
GREENE COUNTY	$36,001,200
GREENEVILLE CITY	$3,506,300
GRUNDY COUNTY	$1,525,640
HAMBLEN COUNTY	$6,340,464
HAMILTON COUNTY	$100,448,026
HANCOCK COUNTY	$432,500
HARDEMAN COUNTY	$2,933,900
HARDIN COUNTY	$31,511,185
HARRIMAN CITY	$1,799,300
HAWKINS COUNTY	$5,800,450
HAYWOOD COUNTY	$330,895
HENDERSON COUNTY	$14,397,000
HENRY COUNTY	$18,053,442
HICKMAN COUNTY	$3,069,000
HOLLOW ROCK-BRUCETON	$315,000
HOUSTON COUNTY	$999,000
HUMBOLDT CITY	$10,868,000
HUMPHREYS COUNTY	$2,064,500
HUNTINGDON SSD	$9,762,000
JACKSON COUNTY	$2,975,800
JACKSON-MADISON COUNTY	$10,873,995
JEFFERSON COUNTY	$13,000,177

Appendix 2-E (cont.)

LEA	Total Cost of Infrastructure Needs for Existing Schools
JOHNSON CITY	$6,024,000
JOHNSON COUNTY	$15,265,374
KINGSPORT CITY	$16,085,745
KNOX COUNTY	$205,051,417
LAKE COUNTY	$706,000
LAUDERDALE COUNTY	$587,000
LAWRENCE COUNTY	$7,484,569
LEBANON CITY	$1,538,000
LENOIR CITY	$6,658,250
LEWIS COUNTY	$2,915,000
LEXINGTON CITY	$3,025,000
LINCOLN COUNTY	$10,850,600
LOUDON COUNTY	$5,877,820
MACON COUNTY	$2,697,000
MANCHESTER CITY	$1,142,000
MARION COUNTY	$7,302,580
MARSHALL COUNTY	$19,727,131
MARYVILLE CITY	$10,419,000
MAURY COUNTY	$14,814,009
MCKENZIE SSD	$1,184,784
MCMINN COUNTY	$929,100
MCNAIRY COUNTY	$4,921,000
MEIGS COUNTY	$2,259,000
MEMPHIS CITY	$401,027,474
MILAN SSD	$11,848,200
MONROE COUNTY	$7,404,464
MONTGOMERY COUNTY	$5,262,100
MOORE COUNTY	$1,750,000
MORGAN COUNTY	$5,760,881
MURFREESBORO CITY	$345,315
NEWPORT CITY	$2,355,000
OAK RIDGE	$11,222,000
OBION COUNTY	$2,316,000
ONEIDA SSD	$0
OVERTON COUNTY	$8,320,700
PARIS SSD	$0
PERRY COUNTY	$16,850,000
PICKETT COUNTY	$2,140,000
POLK COUNTY	$7,406,000
PUTNAM COUNTY	$12,654,400
RHEA COUNTY	$3,005,000
RICHARD CITY SSD	$1,773,000
ROANE COUNTY	$6,803,000
ROBERTSON COUNTY	$4,300,000
ROGERSVILLE CITY	$7,630,000

LEA	Total Cost of Infrastructure Needs for Existing Schools
RUTHERFORD COUNTY	$11,285,124
SCOTT COUNTY	$2,092,000
SEQUATCHIE COUNTY	$4,796,500
SEVIER COUNTY	$14,085,346
SHELBY COUNTY	$55,190,540
SMITH COUNTY	$3,830,100
SOUTH CARROLL SSD	$515,389
STEWART COUNTY	$7,160,000
SULLIVAN COUNTY	$15,641,064
SUMNER COUNTY	$14,724,323
SWEETWATER CITY	$1,363,500
TIPTON COUNTY	$4,119,794
TRENTON SSD	$889,000
TROUSDALE COUNTY	$1,025,000
TULLAHOMA CITY	$14,803,000
UNICOI COUNTY	$2,542,550
UNION CITY	$631,000
UNION COUNTY	$388,000
VAN BUREN COUNTY	$46,200
WARREN COUNTY	$3,058,820
WASHINGTON COUNTY	$12,192,000
WAYNE COUNTY	$5,807,900
WEAKLEY COUNTY	$6,645,000
WEST CARROLL SSD	$2,764,000
WHITE COUNTY	$510,000
WILLIAMSON COUNTY	$3,442,750
WILSON COUNTY	$14,751,834
STATE-WIDE TOTAL	**$1,735,816,096**

Appendix 2-F

Age and Condition of Existing Facilities by LEA

Appendix 2-F shows the average age (in years) of all the main campus buildings and the average overall condition of all the schools in each LEA rank alphabetically. The reported ages of each school in an LEA were summed and divided by the total number of schools in the LEA. To determine the average overall condition, all schools in the LEA were ranked by their reported condition and each condiion was given a number score. The scores ranged from a "5" for schools reporting an "excellent" to a "1" for schools needing to be replaced. The scores were summed for all the schools in the LEA and divided by the number of reporting schools.

LEA	Average Overall Condition of Schools	Average Age Main Campus Building
ALAMO CITY	Good	12
ALCOA CITY	Fair	53
ANDERSON COUNTY	Fair	34
ATHENS CITY	Good	38
BEDFORD COUNTY	Good	25
BELLS CITY	Excellent	14
BENTON COUNTY	Good	40
BLEDSOE COUNTY	Fair	33
BLOUNT COUNTY	Good	27
BRADFORD SSD	Good	32
BRADLEY COUNTY	Good	42
BRISTOL CITY	Fair	52
CAMPBELL COUNTY	Good	35
CANNON COUNTY	Fair	36
CARROLL COUNTY	Good	30
CARTER COUNTY	Good	39
CHEATHAM COUNTY	Good	27
CHESTER COUNTY	Good	30
CLAIBORNE COUNTY	Fair	37
CLAY COUNTY	Good	40
CLEVELAND CITY	Fair	42
CLINTON CITY	Fair	31
COCKE COUNTY	Fair	35
COFFEE COUNTY	Good	35
COVINGTON CITY	Good	59
CROCKETT COUNTY	Good	33
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	Good	31
DAVIDSON COUNTY	Good	39
DAYTON CITY	Excellent	46
DECATUR COUNTY	Good	39
DEKALB COUNTY	Good	31
DICKSON COUNTY	Good	30
DYER COUNTY	Poor	50
DYERSBURG CITY	Good	31
ELIZABETHTON CITY	Good	42
ETOWAH CITY	Good	25
FAYETTE COUNTY	Fair	30
FAYETTEVILLE CITY	Excellent	35
FENTRESS COUNTY	Good	28
FRANKLIN COUNTY	Good	35
FRANKLIN SSD	Excellent	23
GIBSON SSD	Excellent	38
GILES COUNTY	Good	28
GRAINGER COUNTY	Fair	30
GREENE COUNTY	Good	37
GREENEVILLE CITY	Good	35
GRUNDY COUNTY	Fair	31
HAMBLEN COUNTY	Fair	31
HAMILTON COUNTY	Fair	43
HANCOCK COUNTY	Fair	47
HARDEMAN COUNTY	Good	38
HARDIN COUNTY	Good	38
HARRIMAN CITY	Fair	37
HAWKINS COUNTY	Good	39
HAYWOOD COUNTY	Good	30
HENDERSON COUNTY	Good	32
HENRY COUNTY	Good	34
HICKMAN COUNTY	Good	23
HOLLOW ROCK-BRUCETON	Excellent	27
HOUSTON COUNTY	Fair	34
HUMBOLDT CITY	Good	40
HUMPHREYS COUNTY	Good	40
HUNTINGDON SSD	Good	42
JACKSON COUNTY	Fair	42
JACKSON-MADISON CO.	Good	37
JEFFERSON COUNTY	Good	30
JOHNSON CITY	Good	28
JOHNSON COUNTY	Fair	43
KINGSPORT CITY	Good	54
KNOX COUNTY	Fair	41
LAKE COUNTY	Good	43
LAUDERDALE COUNTY	Fair	23
LAWRENCE COUNTY	Good	21
LEBANON CITY	Good	20
LENOIR CITY	Fair	17
LEWIS COUNTY	Good	42
LEXINGTON CITY	Good	32
LINCOLN COUNTY	Good	36
LOUDON COUNTY	Fair	25
MACON COUNTY	Good	31
MANCHESTER CITY	Good	50
MARION COUNTY	Fair	48
MARSHALL COUNTY	Good	17
MARYVILLE CITY	Fair	38
MAURY COUNTY	Good	20
MCKENZIE SSD	Good	27
MCMINN COUNTY	Good	29
MCNAIRY COUNTY	Good	31

Appendix 2-F (cont.)

LEA	Average Overall Condition of Schools	Average Age Main Campus Building
MEIGS COUNTY	Excellent	34
MEMPHIS CITY	Fair	43
MILAN SSD	Good	22
MONROE COUNTY	Fair	35
MONTGOMERY COUNTY	Good	22
MOORE COUNTY	Good	37
MORGAN COUNTY	Good	17
MURFREESBORO CITY	Good	26
NEWPORT CITY	Fair	100
OAK RIDGE	Fair	39
OBION COUNTY	Excellent	15
ONEIDA SSD	Excellent	4
OVERTON COUNTY	Fair	31
PARIS SSD	Good	26
PERRY COUNTY	Fair	44
PICKETT COUNTY	Fair	41
POLK COUNTY	Good	44
PUTNAM COUNTY	Fair	33
RHEA COUNTY	Excellent	21
RICHARD CITY SSD	Fair	72
ROANE COUNTY	Good	34
ROBERTSON COUNTY	Good	35
ROGERSVILLE CITY	Fair	70
RUTHERFORD COUNTY	Good	29
SCOTT COUNTY	Fair	23
SEQUATCHIE COUNTY	Good	19
SEVIER COUNTY	Good	30
SHELBY COUNTY	Fair	25
SMITH COUNTY	Good	41
SOUTH CARROLL SSD	Good	44
STEWART COUNTY	Good	26
SULLIVAN COUNTY	Good	46
SUMNER COUNTY	Good	27
SWEETWATER CITY	Fair	38
TIPTON COUNTY	Fair	12
TRENTON SSD	Excellent	8
TROUSDALE COUNTY	Good	26
TULLAHOMA CITY	Good	39
UNICOI COUNTY	Good	48
UNION CITY	Good	42
UNION COUNTY	Good	27
VAN BUREN COUNTY	Excellent	4
WARREN COUNTY	Good	26
WASHINGTON COUNTY	Good	43
WAYNE COUNTY	Good	33
WEAKLEY COUNTY	Good	25
WEST CARROLL SSD	Good	43
WHITE COUNTY	Good	30
WILLIAMSON COUNTY	Excellent	15
WILSON COUNTY	Good	28
STATE-WIDE AVERAGE	**Good**	**35**

Appendix 2-G
Upgrade Cost:
Reported Cost of Repairs and Renovations to Bring All Schools in LEA Up to a "Good" Condition

Appendix 2-G shows the total cost to each LEA to bring all schools in the system to a "good" condition over the next five years. Repair costs include repairs, renovations and modernization's.

LEA	Number of Schools Reporting Upgrade Needs	Cost of Upgrade Needs
ALAMO CITY	1	$191,000
ALCOA CITY	3	$1,382,500
ANDERSON COUNTY	5	$4,018,500
ATHENS CITY	0	$0
BEDFORD COUNTY	11	$3,196,500
BELLS CITY	0	$0
BENTON COUNTY	1	$20,000
BLEDSOE COUNTY	3	$1,905,800
BLOUNT COUNTY	13	$4,682,000
BRADFORD SSD	2	$87,000
BRADLEY COUNTY	13	$10,877,030
BRISTOL CITY	5	$1,326,000
CAMPBELL COUNTY	8	$6,169,676
CANNON COUNTY	5	$2,368,500
CARROLL COUNTY	2	$371,300
CARTER COUNTY	7	$2,800,000
CHEATHAM COUNTY	8	$660,000
CHESTER COUNTY	4	$10,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY	8	$860,205
CLAY COUNTY	3	$1,247,500
CLEVELAND CITY	8	$9,061,000
CLINTON CITY	2	$917,101
COCKE COUNTY	11	$14,146,301
COFFEE COUNTY	0	$0
COVINGTON CITY	2	$142,000
CROCKETT COUNTY	2	$350,000
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	7	$2,250,000
DAVIDSON COUNTY	34	$77,542,000
DAYTON CITY	1	$20,000
DECATUR COUNTY	3	$6,200
DEKALB COUNTY	2	$520,000
DICKSON COUNTY	5	$3,202,100
DYER COUNTY	8	$60,068,000
DYERSBURG CITY	1	$120,000
ELIZABETHTON CITY	3	$1,255,000
ETOWAH CITY	0	$0
FAYETTE COUNTY	6	$174,000
FAYETTEVILLE CITY	1	$1,500,000
FENTRESS COUNTY	4	$2,770,000

LEA	Number of Schools Reporting Upgrade Needs	Cost of Upgrade Needs
FRANKLIN COUNTY	10	$1,395,350
FRANKLIN SSD	6	$885,554
GIBSON SSD	3	$613,000
GILES COUNTY	8	$1,039,000
GRAINGER COUNTY	6	$1,935,000
GREENE COUNTY	14	$19,282,000
GREENEVILLE CITY	2	$612,000
GRUNDY COUNTY	6	$924,640
HAMBLEN COUNTY	15	$3,237,045
HAMILTON COUNTY	75	$87,963,200
HANCOCK COUNTY	2	$321,000
HARDEMAN COUNTY	8	$620,000
HARDIN COUNTY	5	$15,412,500
HARRIMAN CITY	3	$932,300
HAWKINS COUNTY	10	$2,759,250
HAYWOOD COUNTY	2	$128,664
HENDERSON COUNTY	8	$5,910,000
HENRY COUNTY	4	$15,237,242
HICKMAN COUNTY	4	$45,000
HOLLOW ROCK-BRUCE	0	$0
HOUSTON COUNTY	3	$422,000
HUMBOLDT CITY	5	$9,670,000
HUMPHREYS COUNTY	2	$216,000
HUNTINGDON SSD	3	$7,890,000
JACKSON COUNTY	4	$1,315,000
JACKSON-MADISON CO	16	$3,224,500
JEFFERSON COUNTY	4	$4,853,123
JOHNSON CITY	6	$1,135,000
JOHNSON COUNTY	7	$8,693,643
KINGSPORT CITY	5	$13,187,470
KNOX COUNTY	78	$106,430,677
LAKE COUNTY	1	$450,000
LAUDERDALE COUNTY	0	$0
LAWRENCE COUNTY	10	$4,942,731
LEBANON CITY	2	$235,000
LENOIR CITY	1	$750
LEWIS COUNTY	3	$2,120,000
LEXINGTON CITY	0	$0
LINCOLN COUNTY	9	$6,955,000

Appendix 2-G (cont.)

LEA	Number of Schools Reporting Upgrade Needs	Cost of Upgrade Needs
LOUDON COUNTY	8	$1,037,820
MACON COUNTY	3	$647,000
MANCHESTER CITY	3	$260,000
MARION COUNTY	8	$7,212,150
MARSHALL COUNTY	6	$10,863,000
MARYVILLE CITY	5	$5,220,000
MAURY COUNTY	13	$5,320,500
MCKENZIE SSD	2	$877,284
MCMINN COUNTY	7	$596,000
MCNAIRY COUNTY	7	$890,000
MEIGS COUNTY	0	$0
MEMPHIS CITY	156	$277,145,974
MILAN SSD	1	$10,500,000
MONROE COUNTY	5	$5,324,108
MONTGOMERY CO.	11	$2,316,000
MOORE COUNTY	0	$0
MORGAN COUNTY	5	$2,207,881
MURFREESBORO CITY	2	$195,315
NEWPORT CITY	0	$0
OAK RIDGE	6	$4,530,000
OBION COUNTY	6	$2,151,000
ONEIDA SSD	0	$0
OVERTON COUNTY	7	$4,478,000
PARIS SSD	0	$0
PERRY COUNTY	3	$9,200,000
PICKETT COUNTY	2	$1,500,000
POLK COUNTY	6	$5,475,000
PUTNAM COUNTY	11	$7,688,500
RHEA COUNTY	2	$20,000
RICHARD CITY SSD	1	$1,573,000
ROANE COUNTY	14	$4,595,000
ROBERTSON COUNTY	4	$4,300,000
ROGERSVILLE CITY	1	$1,300,000
RUTHERFORD COUNTY	9	$788,000
SCOTT COUNTY	4	$402,000
SEQUATCHIE COUNTY	3	$3,500,000
SEVIER COUNTY	11	$3,808,000
SHELBY COUNTY	25	$22,115,000
SMITH COUNTY	7	$790,000
SOUTH CARROLL SSD	2	$250,739
STEWART COUNTY	3	$860,000
SULLIVAN COUNTY	24	$2,357,000
SUMNER COUNTY	15	$6,632,160
SWEETWATER CITY	3	$788,500
TIPTON COUNTY	8	$546,312
TRENTON SSD	0	$0
TROUSDALE COUNTY	2	$285,000
TULLAHOMA CITY	4	$13,440,000
UNICOI COUNTY	1	not reported
UNION CITY	2	$302,500
UNION COUNTY	3	$106,000
VAN BUREN COUNTY	0	$0
WARREN COUNTY	7	$1,360,800
WASHINGTON COUNTY	3	$7,256,000
WAYNE COUNTY	8	$2,821,900
WEAKLEY COUNTY	3	$3,075,000
WEST CARROLL SSD	1	$2,395,000
WHITE COUNTY	3	$45,000
WILLIAMSON COUNTY	1	$541,500
WILSON COUNTY	9	$5,065,000
STATE-WIDE TOTAL	**1,018**	**$1,004,165,795**

Appendix 2-H
Reported Federal and State Mandate Compliance Cost for Existing Schools by LEA

Appendix 2-H shows the reported cost over the five years for LEA to comply with Federal and State mandates. These costs do not include any associated with Education Improvement Act compliance.

LEA	Number of Schools reporting Mandates	Cost of Mandate-related Needs
ALAMO CITY	0	$0
ALCOA CITY	3	$14,500
ANDERSON COUNTY	12	$897,780
ATHENS CITY	0	$0
BEDFORD COUNTY	3	$1,380,000
BELLS CITY	0	$0
BENTON COUNTY	0	$0
BLEDSOE COUNTY	3	$65,000
BLOUNT COUNTY	5	$365,000
BRADFORD SSD	0	$0
BRADLEY COUNTY	14	$2,243,600
BRISTOL CITY	7	$350,000
CAMPBELL COUNTY	4	$576,004
CANNON COUNTY	3	$220,000
CARROLL COUNTY	2	$58,000
CARTER COUNTY	0	$0
CHEATHAM COUNTY	8	$244,000
CHESTER COUNTY	0	$0
CLAIBORNE COUNTY	4	$89,000
CLAY COUNTY	0	$0
CLEVELAND CITY	1	$40,000
CLINTON CITY	2	$181,160
COCKE COUNTY	11	$27,500
COFFEE COUNTY	0	$0
COVINGTON CITY	0	$0
CROCKETT COUNTY	0	$0
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	3	$25,000
DAVIDSON COUNTY	0	$0
DAYTON CITY	0	$0
DECATUR COUNTY	0	$0
DEKALB COUNTY	4	$4,743
DICKSON COUNTY	1	$7,000
DYER COUNTY	1	$50,000
DYERSBURG CITY	1	$50,000
ELIZABETHTON CITY	2	$30,000
ETOWAH CITY	0	$0
FAYETTE COUNTY	3	$109,000
FAYETTEVILLE CITY	0	$0

LEA	Number of Schools reporting Mandates	Cost of Mandate-related Needs
FENTRESS COUNTY	0	$0
FRANKLIN COUNTY	4	$6,000
FRANKLIN SSD	1	$5,400
GIBSON SSD	0	$0
GILES COUNTY	0	$0
GRAINGER COUNTY	0	$0
GREENE COUNTY	8	$199,000
GREENEVILLE CITY	0	$0
GRUNDY COUNTY	2	$45,000
HAMBLEN COUNTY	4	$10,000
HAMILTON COUNTY	43	$2,913,500
HANCOCK COUNTY	2	$18,000
HARDEMAN COUNTY	4	$38,000
HARDIN COUNTY	4	$35,000
HARRIMAN CITY	2	$270,000
HAWKINS COUNTY	9	$277,800
HAYWOOD COUNTY	0	$0
HENDERSON COUNTY	1	not reported
HENRY COUNTY	4	$91,000
HICKMAN COUNTY	1	not reported
HOLLOW ROCK-BRUCET	2	$125,000
HOUSTON COUNTY	1	$10,000
HUMBOLDT CITY	0	$0
HUMPHREYS COUNTY	1	not reported
HUNTINGDON SSD	1	$7,000
JACKSON COUNTY	0	$0
JACKSON-MADISON COU	17	$2,555,050
JEFFERSON COUNTY	0	$0
JOHNSON CITY	6	$295,000
JOHNSON COUNTY	0	$0
KINGSPORT CITY	4	not reported
KNOX COUNTY	83	$45,851,483
LAKE COUNTY	0	$0
LAUDERDALE COUNTY	0	$0
LAWRENCE COUNTY	4	$106,000
LEBANON CITY	0	$0
LENOIR CITY	1	$100,000
LEWIS COUNTY	0	$0

Appendix 2-H (cont.)

LEA	Number of Schools reporting Mandates	Cost of Mandate-related Needs
LEXINGTON CITY	0	$0
LINCOLN COUNTY	7	$172,000
LOUDON COUNTY	2	$147,000
MACON COUNTY	3	$95,000
MANCHESTER CITY	0	$0
MARION COUNTY	0	$0
MARSHALL COUNTY	0	$0
MARYVILLE CITY	0	$0
MAURY COUNTY	3	$240,000
MCKENZIE SSD	0	$0
MCMINN COUNTY	1	$1,000
MCNAIRY COUNTY	3	not reported
MEIGS COUNTY	4	$12,000
MEMPHIS CITY	125	$20,706,500
MILAN SSD	2	$55,000
MONROE COUNTY	8	$1,127,756
MONTGOMERY COUNTY	2	$125,000
MOORE COUNTY	2	not reported
MORGAN COUNTY	4	$190,000
MURFREESBORO CITY	0	$0
NEWPORT CITY	1	$200,000
OAK RIDGE	7	$1,363,000
OBION COUNTY	0	$0
ONEIDA SSD	0	$0
OVERTON COUNTY	5	$224,200
PARIS SSD	0	$0
PERRY COUNTY	3	$950,000
PICKETT COUNTY	0	$0
POLK COUNTY	3	$50,000
PUTNAM COUNTY	4	$260,000
RHEA COUNTY	0	$0
RICHARD CITY SSD	1	$125,000
ROANE COUNTY	6	$278,000
ROBERTSON COUNTY	0	$0
ROGERSVILLE CITY	1	$600,000
RUTHERFORD COUNTY	7	$241,500
SCOTT COUNTY	1	$10,000
SEQUATCHIE COUNTY	1	$30,000
SEVIER COUNTY	2	$17,000
SHELBY COUNTY	7	$1,010,000
SMITH COUNTY	2	$15,000
SOUTH CARROLL SSD	0	$0
STEWART COUNTY	2	$20,000
SULLIVAN COUNTY	29	$2,452,724
SUMNER COUNTY	8	$225,400
SWEETWATER CITY	3	$72,000
TIPTON COUNTY	6	$6,000
TRENTON SSD	0	$0
TROUSDALE COUNTY	1	$220,000
TULLAHOMA CITY	0	$0
UNICOI COUNTY	4	$407,550
UNION CITY	1	$2,500
UNION COUNTY	0	$0
VAN BUREN COUNTY	2	$20,000
WARREN COUNTY	0	$0
WASHINGTON COUNTY	0	$0
WAYNE COUNTY	3	$35,000
WEAKLEY COUNTY	0	$0
WEST CARROLL SSD	0	$0
WHITE COUNTY	0	$0
WILLIAMSON COUNTY	0	$0
WILSON COUNTY	3	$100,000
STATE-WIDE TOTALS	**585**	**$91,791,650**

Appendix 2-I

Reported Total Costs of Current Technology Needs by LEA

Appendix 2-I shows each LEA's reported cost of providing technology resources to its students.

LEA	Number of Schools Reporting Technology Needs	Cost of Technology Needs
ALAMO CITY	1	$215,000
ALCOA CITY	3	$422,800
ANDERSON COUNTY	8	$1,675,730
ATHENS CITY	5	$185,000
BEDFORD COUNTY	9	$1,041,650
BELLS CITY	0	$0
BENTON COUNTY	5	$214,305
BLEDSOE COUNTY	4	$225,000
BLOUNT COUNTY	10	$600,000
BRADFORD SSD	2	$20,000
BRADLEY COUNTY	16	$1,571,500
BRISTOL CITY	8	$385,000
CAMPBELL COUNTY	10	$520,500
CANNON COUNTY	7	$247,515
CARROLL COUNTY	2	$445,000
CARTER COUNTY	0	$0
CHEATHAM COUNTY	10	$551,500
CHESTER COUNTY	1	$75,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY	11	$355,800
CLAY COUNTY	1	$10,000
CLEVELAND CITY	7	$2,769,600
CLINTON CITY	3	$317,535
COCKE COUNTY	11	$2,826,000
COFFEE COUNTY	9	$1,098,800
COVINGTON CITY	2	$16,000
CROCKETT COUNTY	0	$0
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	7	$1,337,956
DAVIDSON COUNTY	1	$4,000
DAYTON CITY	1	$150,000
DECATUR COUNTY	4	$340,000
DEKALB COUNTY	2	$33,000
DICKSON COUNTY	8	$505,200
DYER COUNTY	0	$0
DYERSBURG CITY	4	$197,000
ELIZABETHTON CITY	5	$178,200
ETOWAH CITY	1	$120,000
FAYETTE COUNTY	8	$276,700
FAYETTEVILLE CITY	2	$400,000

LEA	Number of Schools Reporting Technology Needs	Cost of Technology Needs
FENTRESS COUNTY	0	$0
FRANKLIN COUNTY	12	$781,300
FRANKLIN SSD	6	$2,800,000
GIBSON SSD	4	$425,000
GILES COUNTY	7	$331,000
GRAINGER COUNTY	6	$518,700
GREENE COUNTY	14	$3,090,200
GREENEVILLE CITY	7	$2,282,300
GRUNDY COUNTY	6	$216,000
HAMBLEN COUNTY	13	$402,344
HAMILTON COUNTY	70	$6,061,326
HANCOCK COUNTY	5	$93,500
HARDEMAN COUNTY	5	$143,900
HARDIN COUNTY	10	$543,685
HARRIMAN CITY	2	$97,000
HAWKINS COUNTY	13	$1,239,400
HAYWOOD COUNTY	4	$202,231
HENDERSON COUNTY	8	$506,000
HENRY COUNTY	6	$441,200
HICKMAN COUNTY	4	$224,000
HOLLOW ROCK-BRUCET	2	$190,000
HOUSTON COUNTY	3	$267,000
HUMBOLDT CITY	5	$948,000
HUMPHREYS COUNTY	5	$392,100
HUNTINGDON SSD	3	$1,515,000
JACKSON COUNTY	4	$55,800
JACKSON-MADISON COU	15	$853,945
JEFFERSON COUNTY	9	$1,539,000
JOHNSON CITY	9	$1,594,000
JOHNSON COUNTY	8	$175,436
KINGSPORT CITY	10	$2,898,275
KNOX COUNTY	83	$50,977,257
LAKE COUNTY	3	$256,000
LAUDERDALE COUNTY	6	$587,000
LAWRENCE COUNTY	9	$235,838
LEBANON CITY	5	$103,000
LENOIR CITY	3	$47,500
LEWIS COUNTY	3	$795,000

Appendix 2-I (cont.)

LEA	Number of Schools Reporting Technology Needs	Cost of Technology Needs
LEXINGTON CITY	1	$25,000
LINCOLN COUNTY	9	$975,200
LOUDON COUNTY	9	$838,000
MACON COUNTY	3	$105,000
MANCHESTER CITY	3	$82,000
MARION COUNTY	3	$90,430
MARSHALL COUNTY	8	$1,104,131
MARYVILLE CITY	6	$1,049,000
MAURY COUNTY	16	$3,093,509
MCKENZIE SSD	3	$307,500
MCMINN COUNTY	8	$332,100
MCNAIRY COUNTY	8	$531,000
MEIGS COUNTY	4	$17,000
MEMPHIS CITY	148	$93,040,000
MILAN SSD	3	$593,200
MONROE COUNTY	11	$370,200
MONTGOMERY COUNTY	14	$581,100
MOORE COUNTY	0	$0
MORGAN COUNTY	7	$252,500
MURFREESBORO CITY	0	$0
NEWPORT CITY	1	$155,000
OAK RIDGE	8	$5,329,000
OBION COUNTY	5	$165,000
ONEIDA SSD	0	$0
OVERTON COUNTY	8	$208,500
PARIS SSD	0	$0
PERRY COUNTY	3	$2,500,000
PICKETT COUNTY	0	$0
POLK COUNTY	6	$241,000
PUTNAM COUNTY	10	$955,900
RHEA COUNTY	5	$2,435,000
RICHARD CITY SSD	1	$75,000
ROANE COUNTY	9	$130,000
ROBERTSON COUNTY	0	$0
ROGERSVILLE CITY	1	$530,000
RUTHERFORD COUNTY	19	$1,136,250
SCOTT COUNTY	4	$295,000
SEQUATCHIE COUNTY	3	$216,500
SEVIER COUNTY	15	$1,700,586
SHELBY COUNTY	43	$2,915,540
SMITH COUNTY	9	$482,100
SOUTH CARROLL SSD	2	$134,650
STEWART COUNTY	3	$80,000
SULLIVAN COUNTY	23	$831,340
SUMNER COUNTY	30	$3,423,513
SWEETWATER CITY	3	$263,000
TIPTON COUNTY	9	$2,797,482
TRENTON SSD	3	$179,000
TROUSDALE COUNTY	3	$120,000
TULLAHOMA CITY	7	$763,000
UNICOI COUNTY	6	$1,035,000
UNION CITY	2	$326,000
UNION COUNTY	3	$282,000
VAN BUREN COUNTY	2	$26,200
WARREN COUNTY	9	$678,020
WASHINGTON COUNTY	12	$3,386,000
WAYNE COUNTY	4	$681,000
WEAKLEY COUNTY	12	$3,570,000
WEST CARROLL SSD	2	$119,000
WHITE COUNTY	3	$195,000
WILLIAMSON COUNTY	4	$431,250
WILSON COUNTY	14	$1,380,400
STATE-WIDE TOTALS	**1145**	**$246,719,629**

Appendix 2-J
Number of Reported Additional Classrooms Required to Comply with Education Improvement Act of 1992 by LEA

Appendix 2-J shows the reported number of new classrooms that will be required by each LEA to comply with the Education Improvement Act over the next five years.

LEA	Number of Additional Classrooms
ALAMO CITY	2
ALCOA CITY	0
ANDERSON COUNTY	40
ATHENS CITY	0
BEDFORD COUNTY	29
BELLS CITY	0
BENTON COUNTY	27
BLEDSOE COUNTY	9
BLOUNT COUNTY	50
BRADFORD SSD	4
BRADLEY COUNTY	66
BRISTOL CITY	8
CAMPBELL COUNTY	34
CANNON COUNTY	39
CARROLL COUNTY	2
CARTER COUNTY	0
CHEATHAM COUNTY	16
CHESTER COUNTY	6
CLAIBORNE COUNTY	9
CLAY COUNTY	0
CLEVELAND CITY	3
CLINTON CITY	9
COCKE COUNTY	23
COFFEE COUNTY	0
COVINGTON CITY	0
CROCKETT COUNTY	2
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	35
DAVIDSON COUNTY	301
DAYTON CITY	5
DECATUR COUNTY	0
DEKALB COUNTY	19
DICKSON COUNTY	30
DYER COUNTY	2
DYERSBURG CITY	0
ELIZABETHTON CITY	6
ETOWAH CITY	0
FAYETTE COUNTY	26
FAYETTEVILLE CITY	0
FENTRESS COUNTY	6

LEA	Number of Additional Classrooms
FRANKLIN COUNTY	70
FRANKLIN SSD	0
GIBSON SSD	2
GILES COUNTY	51
GRAINGER COUNTY	54
GREENE COUNTY	80
GREENEVILLE CITY	4
GRUNDY COUNTY	7
HAMBLEN COUNTY	58
HAMILTON COUNTY	69
HANCOCK COUNTY	12
HARDEMAN COUNTY	51
HARDIN COUNTY	14
HARRIMAN CITY	2
HAWKINS COUNTY	27
HAYWOOD COUNTY	0
HENDERSON COUNTY	46
HENRY COUNTY	20
HICKMAN COUNTY	33
HOLLOW ROCK-BRUCETON	0
HOUSTON COUNTY	11
HUMBOLDT CITY	5
HUMPHREYS COUNTY	26
HUNTINGDON SSD	6
JACKSON COUNTY	39
JACKSON-MADISON COUNTY	70
JEFFERSON COUNTY	72
JOHNSON CITY	12
JOHNSON COUNTY	34
KINGSPORT CITY	22
KNOX COUNTY	42
LAKE COUNTY	0
LAUDERDALE COUNTY	0
LAWRENCE COUNTY	22
LEBANON CITY	10
LENOIR CITY	11
LEWIS COUNTY	0
LEXINGTON CITY	7
LINCOLN COUNTY	26

Appendix 2-J (cont.)

LEA	Number of Additional Classrooms
LOUDON COUNTY	33
MACON COUNTY	18
MANCHESTER CITY	16
MARION COUNTY	3
MARSHALL COUNTY	42
MARYVILLE CITY	32
MAURY COUNTY	77
MCKENZIE SSD	0
MCMINN COUNTY	0
MCNAIRY COUNTY	53
MEIGS COUNTY	18
MEMPHIS CITY	415
MILAN SSD	8
MONROE COUNTY	9
MONTGOMERY COUNTY	29
MOORE COUNTY	18
MORGAN COUNTY	39
MURFREESBORO CITY	10
NEWPORT CITY	10
OAK RIDGE	0
OBION COUNTY	0
ONEIDA SSD	22
OVERTON COUNTY	44
PARIS SSD	0
PERRY COUNTY	47
PICKETT COUNTY	10
POLK COUNTY	26
PUTNAM COUNTY	43
RHEA COUNTY	17
RICHARD CITY SSD	0
ROANE COUNTY	15
ROBERTSON COUNTY	10
ROGERSVILLE CITY	8
RUTHERFORD COUNTY	147
SCOTT COUNTY	21
SEQUATCHIE COUNTY	11
SEVIER COUNTY	74
SHELBY COUNTY	297
SMITH COUNTY	33
SOUTH CARROLL SSD	2
STEWART COUNTY	39
SULLIVAN COUNTY	41
SUMNER COUNTY	66
SWEETWATER CITY	3
TIPTON COUNTY	215
TRENTON SSD	8

LEA	Number of Additional Classrooms
TROUSDALE COUNTY	13
TULLAHOMA CITY	6
UNICOI COUNTY	12
UNION CITY	0
UNION COUNTY	0
VAN BUREN COUNTY	0
WARREN COUNTY	12
WASHINGTON COUNTY	10
WAYNE COUNTY	30
WEAKLEY COUNTY	0
WEST CARROLL SSD	5
WHITE COUNTY	5
WILLIAMSON COUNTY	26
WILSON COUNTY	100
STATE-WIDE TOTAL	**4,071**

Appendix 2-K
Reported Total Cost of All Education Improvement Act of 1992
Compliance Related Infrastructure Needs

Appendix 2-K shows the total cost reported by each LEA for existing schools and for System-wide Needs and New Scho necessary for compliance with the Education Improvement Act of 1992.
(LEAs that did not report a need in this category are displayed below with zero cost.
LEAs that reported needs but provided no cost estimate are listed with cost "not reported.")

LEA	Reported Total Cost of All EIA Compliance-related Infrastructure Needs
ALAMO CITY	$30,000
ALCOA CITY	$0
ANDERSON COUNTY	$3,708,750
ATHENS CITY	$0
BEDFORD COUNTY	$18,765,000
BELLS CITY	$0
BENTON COUNTY	$20,559,000
BLEDSOE COUNTY	$4,200,000
BLOUNT COUNTY	$2,450,000
BRADFORD SSD	$115,000
BRADLEY COUNTY	$29,895,600
BRISTOL CITY	$1,050,000
CAMPBELL COUNTY	$4,107,570
CANNON COUNTY	$5,303,960
CARROLL COUNTY	$100,000
CARTER COUNTY	$6,000,000
CHEATHAM COUNTY	not reported
CHESTER COUNTY	not reported
CLAIBORNE COUNTY	$565,000
CLAY COUNTY	$0
CLEVELAND CITY	$42,432,000
CLINTON CITY	$150,000
COCKE COUNTY	$2,300,000
COFFEE COUNTY	$2,600,000
COVINGTON CITY	$0
CROCKETT COUNTY	$75,000
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	$15,960,000
DAVIDSON COUNTY	$110,321,300
DAYTON CITY	$300,000
DECATUR COUNTY	not reported
DEKALB COUNTY	$3,765,400
DICKSON COUNTY	$36,700,000
DYER COUNTY	$30,040,000
DYERSBURG CITY	$0
ELIZABETHTON CITY	$525,000
ETOWAH CITY	$0
FAYETTE COUNTY	$0

LEA	Reported Total Cost of All EIA Compliance-related Infrastructure Needs
FAYETTEVILLE CITY	$0
FENTRESS COUNTY	$292,000
FRANKLIN COUNTY	$42,090,000
FRANKLIN SSD	$1,215,000
GIBSON SSD	$100,000
GILES COUNTY	$4,398,000
GRAINGER COUNTY	$5,450,000
GREENE COUNTY	$13,430,000
GREENEVILLE CITY	$612,000
GRUNDY COUNTY	$340,000
HAMBLEN COUNTY	$2,691,075
HAMILTON COUNTY	$16,010,000
HANCOCK COUNTY	not reported
HARDEMAN COUNTY	$2,132,000
HARDIN COUNTY	$15,520,000
HARRIMAN CITY	$500,000
HAWKINS COUNTY	$1,524,000
HAYWOOD COUNTY	$0
HENDERSON COUNTY	$7,981,000
HENRY COUNTY	$2,284,000
HICKMAN COUNTY	$9,800,000
HOLLOW ROCK-BRUCETON	$6,200,000
HOUSTON COUNTY	$8,300,000
HUMBOLDT CITY	$250,000
HUMPHREYS COUNTY	$1,456,400
HUNTINGDON SSD	$7,350,000
JACKSON COUNTY	$1,605,000
JACKSON-MADISON COUNTY	$4,240,500
JEFFERSON COUNTY	$6,608,054
JOHNSON CITY	$3,000,000
JOHNSON COUNTY	$16,291,848
KINGSPORT CITY	$8,500,000
KNOX COUNTY	$1,792,000
LAKE COUNTY	$0
LAUDERDALE COUNTY	$0
LAWRENCE COUNTY	$2,200,000
LEBANON CITY	$1,200,000

Appendix 2-K (cont.)

LEA ID	Reported Total Cost of All EIA Compliance-related Infrastructure Needs
LENOIR CITY	$6,510,000
LEWIS COUNTY	$0
LEXINGTON CITY	$3,000,000
LINCOLN COUNTY	$2,748,400
LOUDON COUNTY	$3,855,000
MACON COUNTY	$2,350,000
MANCHESTER CITY	$2,162,000
MARION COUNTY	$8,476,250
MARSHALL COUNTY	$15,760,000
MARYVILLE CITY	$4,150,000
MAURY COUNTY	$18,160,000
MCKENZIE SSD	$0
MCMINN COUNTY	$0
MCNAIRY COUNTY	$3,500,000
MEIGS COUNTY	$2,230,000
MEMPHIS CITY	$55,135,000
MILAN SSD	$700,000
MONROE COUNTY	$582,400
MONTGOMERY COUNTY	$2,240,000
MOORE COUNTY	$1,750,000
MORGAN COUNTY	$3,110,500
MURFREESBORO CITY	$150,000
NEWPORT CITY	$2,000,000
OAK RIDGE	$0
OBION COUNTY	$0
ONEIDA SSD	$0
OVERTON COUNTY	$3,410,000
PARIS SSD	$0
PERRY COUNTY	$10,700,000
PICKETT COUNTY	$640,000
POLK COUNTY	$12,340,000
PUTNAM COUNTY	$28,750,000
RHEA COUNTY	$4,550,000
RICHARD CITY SSD	$0
ROANE COUNTY	$1,800,000
ROBERTSON COUNTY	$0
ROGERSVILLE CITY	$5,200,000
RUTHERFORD COUNTY	$9,119,374
SCOTT COUNTY	$1,385,000
SEQUATCHIE COUNTY	$1,050,000
SEVIER COUNTY	$8,559,760
SHELBY COUNTY	$29,150,000
SMITH COUNTY	$17,543,000
SOUTH CARROLL SSD	$130,000
STEWART COUNTY	$23,200,000

LEA ID	Reported Total Cost of All EIA Compliance-related Infrastructure Needs
SULLIVAN COUNTY	$10,000,000
SUMNER COUNTY	$4,443,250
SWEETWATER CITY	$240,000
TIPTON COUNTY	$770,000
TRENTON SSD	$710,000
TROUSDALE COUNTY	$400,000
TULLAHOMA CITY	$5,100,000
UNICOI COUNTY	$12,150,507
UNION CITY	$0
UNION COUNTY	$0
VAN BUREN COUNTY	$5,000,000
WARREN COUNTY	$1,020,000
WASHINGTON COUNTY	$1,550,000
WAYNE COUNTY	$17,270,000
WEAKLEY COUNTY	$0
WEST CARROLL SSD	$250,000
WHITE COUNTY	$2,270,000
WILLIAMSON COUNTY	$2,470,000
WILSON COUNTY	$13,706,434
STATE-WIDE TOTAL	$910,828,332

Appendix 3

State of Tennessee

PUBLIC CHAPTER NO. 817

SENATE BILL NO. 2097

By Rochelle

Substituted for: House Bill No. 3257

By Rhinehart

AN ACT To amend Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 4, Chapter 10 and Section 67-9-102(b)(3), relative to a statewide public infrastructure needs inventory.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE:

SECTION 1. Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 4, Chapter 10, is amended by adding the following as a new section:

Section ___. (a) In order for the commission to fulfill its obligations to study and report on the existing, necessary and desirable allocation of state and local fiscal resources, the powers and functions of local governments, and relationship between the state and local governments, and its duties to engage in activities for the accomplishment of these various studies and reports, the commission shall annually compile and maintain an inventory of needed infrastructure within this state. The information and data gathered by such an annual inventory is deemed necessary in order for the state, municipal and county governments of Tennessee to develop goals, strategies and programs which would improve the quality of life of its citizens, support livable communities and enhance and encourage the overall economic development of the state through the provision of adequate and essential public infrastructure. All funds necessary and required for this inventory shall be administered through the commission's annual budget and such funds shall be in addition to the commission's annual operational budget amounts. The inventory shall include, at a minimum, needed public infrastructure facilities which would enhance and encourage economic development, improve the quality of life of the citizens and support livable communities within each municipality, utility district, county and development district region of the state and shall include needs for transportation, water and wastewater, industrial sites, municipal solid waste, recreation, low and moderate income housing, telecommunications, other infrastructure needs such as public buildings (including city halls, courthouses and K-12 educational facilities) and other public facilities needs as deemed necessary by the commission. The data shall be compiled on a county-by-county basis within each development district area. In order to accomplish this inventory, the commission shall annually contract for the services of the state's nine (9) development districts and shall compensate each of the development districts at a rate of five cents ($.05) per capita or fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), whichever is greater. The per capita amount shall be based upon the population counts within each development district as determined from the latest county population estimates reported by the United States Department of Commerce, U.S. Bureau of the Census or its federal functional equivalent. From funds allocated to the commission for the purpose of conducting this annual inventory, the commission shall retain for its necessary administration and coordination costs for this annual inventory one and one-half cents ($.015) per capita based upon the state total population as determined by the latest county population estimates reported by the United States Department of Commerce, U.S. Bureau of the Census or its federal functional equivalent.

(b) In compiling the public infrastructure needs inventory on a county-by-county basis, at a minimum, the commission shall consult with each county

executive, mayor, local planning commission, utility district, county road superintendent and other appropriate local and state officials concerning planned and/or anticipated public infrastructure needs over the next five (5) year period, together with estimated costs and time of need within that time frame.

(c) The public infrastructure needs inventory shall not include projects considered to be normal or routine maintenance. Moreover, infrastructure needs projects included in the inventory should involve a capital cost of not less than fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). The infrastructure needs inventory shall not duplicate the extensive needs data currently maintained by various state agencies on state facilities which are presently available to the commission. Provided, however, this limitation does not prohibit one (1) or more counties or municipalities from identifying a need for a vocational educational facility or a community college or a new public health building in a particular local area. In addition, the commission may request various state agencies to supply various needs data that may be available in such areas as highway or rail bridges, airports or other areas.

(d) The annual public infrastructure needs inventory by each development district shall be conducted utilizing standard statewide procedures and summary format as determined by the commission to facilitate ease and accuracy in summarizing statewide needs and costs.

(e) The public infrastructure needs inventory shall be completed by the development districts and submitted to the commission no later than June 30 of each year.

(f) The annual inventory of statewide public infrastructure needs and costs for provision of adequate and essential public infrastructure shall be presented by the commission to the Tennessee General Assembly at its next regular annual session following completion of the inventory each year.

SECTION 2. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 4-10-107, is amended by adding the following as a new subdivision (d):

(d) In addition to any funds appropriated by the General Assembly to the commission, the commission is authorized to receive annual allocations of funds from the Tennessee State Revenue Sharing Act, Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 67-9-102(b)(3), for the purpose of conducting an annual public infrastructure needs inventory to aid in the provision of adequate and essential public infrastructure statewide for the improvement of the quality of life of Tennessee citizens, the support of livable communities and the enhancement and encouragement of the overall economic development of the state.

SECTION 3. Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 67-9-102(b)(3), is amended by adding the following immediately before the last sentence in said subdivision:

If, in any year there are funds remaining after the allocation provided for in subdivisions (b)(1) and (2) of this subsection, or there are no impacted areas and after any allocation to the University of Tennessee as provided for in this subdivision, then any remaining funds, not to exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total of such impact funds per year, shall be allocated by the Comptroller of the Treasury to the Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations shall utilize such funds for an annual inventory of statewide public infrastructure needs. This annual inventory of statewide public infrastructure needs is to be used to support efforts by state, county and municipal governments of Tennessee in developing goals, strategies and programs to provide adequate and essential public infrastructure which is needed to enhance and encourage economic development, support livable communities and improve the quality of life for the citizens of this state.

SECTION 4. This act shall take effect July 1, 1996, the public welfare requiring it.

SENATE BILL NO. 2097

PASSED: April 11, 1996

JOHN S. WILDER
SPEAKER OF THE SENATE

JIMMY NAIFEH, *SPEAKER*
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPROVED this 25th day of April 1996

DON SUNDQUIST, *GOVERNOR*

RECENT PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE TACIR

COMMISSION REPORTS

- ☐ Accountability for Funding Education in Tennessee January 1998
- ☐ Financing Tennessee Government in the 21st Century, January 1999
- ☐ Tennessee Public Infrastructure Needs Inventory Assessment for FY 1998, January 1999

STAFF INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL REPORTS

- ☐ Education Finance Reform in Tennessee, October 1997
- ☐ Fiscal Capacity for Funding K-12 Education: Fiscal Year 1997-98, September 1997
- ☐ Growth Policy, Annexation, and Incorporation Under Public Chapter 1101 of 1998: A Guide for Community Leaders, September 1998

TAX RELATED REPORTS

- ☐ Measuring Fiscal Capacity: Tennessee Compared to the Southeastern States, December 1997
- ☐ Competitive Edge: The Tax and Business Climate in Tennessee, January 1998
- ☐ Understanding Tennessee's Tax System: Problems and Issues, March 1998
- ☐ The Evolution of Tennessee's Economy and its Relationship to the State Revenue System, March 1998
- ☐ National Perspectives on Tennessee Taxes, April 1998

BRIEFS

- ☐ Corporate Taxes and the Business Climate in Tennessee, March 1997
- ☐ School Facilities' Needs in Tennessee, April 1997
- ☐ Education Finance Reform in Tennessee, October 1997

FORTHCOMING COMMISSION REPORT

- ☐ Local Government Tort Liability Issues in Tennessee, February 1999

NAME: _____

ADDRESS _____

_____

PHONE: _____

State of Tennessee
Policy of Non-Discrimination

Pursuant to the State of Tennessee's policy of non-discrimination, the Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, religion, color, national or ethnic origin, age, disability, or military service in its policies, or in the admission or access to, or treatment or employment in, its programs, services or activities.

Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action inquiries or complaints should be directed to the Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations EEO/AA Coordinator or Officer, Suite 508, 226 Capitol Blvd. Bldg., Nashville, TN 37243, (615) 741-3012. ADA inquiries or complaints should also be directed to the Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, ADA Coordinator, Suite 508, 226 Capitol Blvd. Bldg., Nashville, TN 37243, (615) 741-3012.

TACIR, (1/99);
Publication Authorization Number 316314;
1800 copies. This public document
was promulgated at a cost of $2.42 each

TACIR Members:

Senator Robert Rochelle, Chairman
Truman Clark, Vice Chairman

Legislative
Senator Ward Crutchfield
Senator Tommy Haun
Senator Jeff Miller
Senator Robert Rochelle
Rep. Jere Hargrove
Rep. Steve McDaniel
Rep. Randy Rinks
Rep. Larry Turner

Statutory
Rep. Matthew Kisber, FW&M
Senator Douglas Henry, FW&M
Comptroller William Snodgrass

Executive Branch
Lana Ball, Office of the Governor
Commissioner Ruth Johnson, Revenue

Municipal
Victor Ashe, Mayor of Knoxville
Mary Jo Dozier, Councilwoman of Clarksville
Sharon Goldsworthy, Mayor of Germantown
Tom Rowland, Mayor of Cleveland

County
Nancy Allen, Rutherford County Executive
Truman Clark, Carter County Executive
Jeff Huffman, Tipton County Executive
Jim Rout, Shelby County Mayor

Private Citizens
Chaddy Baker, Nashville
David Coffey, Oak Ridge
Thomas Varlan, Knoxville

Other Local Officials
Judy Medearis, County Officials Assn. of TN
Maynard Pate, TN Development Dist. Assn

Staff
Harry A. Green, Executive Director
John Norman, Associate Executive Director
Lynne Holliday, Senior Research Associate
Cliff Lippard, Senior Research Associate
Ross Loder, Senior Research Associate
Bennett McClure, Research Associate
Bob Allen, Senior Research Associate
Cherri Brady, Publications Assistant
Joyce Allen, Executive Assistant
Kim Robertson, Research Assistant

The Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations
Suite 508, 226 Capitol Boulevard, Nashville, Tennessee 37243
(615) 741-3012; FAX: (615) 532-2443